

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petitions of the Nineteenth Century Club, of Oak Park, Ill., and the De Kalb (Ill.) Woman's Club, favoring the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, memorial of the National Council of Women, United States of America, favoring the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, memorial of the Delaware Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, against the adoption of the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. GOOD: Petition of citizens of Marshall County, Iowa, in favor of equal suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. HASTINGS: Memorial of the Civil War revenue cotton-tax claimants; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAYES: Resolutions of Fred Steele Post, No. 70, San Luis Obispo, Cal.; of Sheridan-Dix Post, No. 7, San Jose, Cal.; of R. L. McCook Post, No. 26, Grand Army of the Republic, Watsonville, Cal.; and of E. O. C. Ord Post, No. 82, Los Gatos, Cal., all urging an increase of pensions to all Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Telegram from Womans' Council of Defense for Colorado, by Mary Turner Pope, its corresponding secretary, urging the adoption of the national suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of Margaret Long, Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Huff, Mr. and Mrs. R. F. Feagans, Mr. and Mrs. H. B. Dinwiddie, Mr. and Mrs. S. B. Strong, Mr. and Mrs. W. N. Vaile, Col. and Mrs. Edward Verdeckberg, Mr. and Mrs. Ready Kehehan, Mrs. Mary Montgomery, Rabbi W. S. Friedman, Mrs. Ray David, Mrs. E. W. Burris, Mrs. Mildred L. Thomas, Mrs. C. S. Keys, Lewis Searing, Lucia Hadley, Mrs. Lizzie Forrester, Mrs. Frances Walden, Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Malone, Mabel C. Haynes, Mrs. George Miller, George E. Nightingale, Frank E. Shephard, Ida Hands, Augusta Rothwell, Mr. and Mrs. George Campion, Mr. and Mrs. A. A. Boyd, Mrs. Fred Kerns, Mrs. Mattie O. Peoler, Mabel Forrester, Leilia Kinney, John W. Watson, J. G. Scott, Dora Phelps, Beull Jean Gale, Mrs. Agnes Bishop, Mrs. Florence Mack, Mrs. Dewey Bailey, Sen. Agnes C. Riddle, W. W. Torrence, Frank Kratke, Helen T. Miller, Eleanor Lawney, Margaret Conway, Fannie Dore, Florence Green, Kate Russell, John L. Russell, Annie Raglan Randall, Mr. and Mrs. J. J. Flint, Ira Dunklee, Nona L. Broiks, Ida J. Booth, Mrs. R. W. Speer, E. L. Doyce, Clarence Hawkins, Samuel D. Nicholson, Mr. and Mrs. W. A. Bennett, Laura C. Holtschneider, Clara Mosser, Charles E. Tibbits, Mr. and Mrs. J. Nolan, Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. Leckenby, Mrs. Gertrude Lee, Alice B. Clark, Mrs. J. H. Teller, Mr. and Mrs. Cecil Rothwell, Theodosia B. Raines, Mr. and Mrs. W. W. Barnett, and Mr. and Mrs. Chalmers Hadley, all of Denver, Colo., favoring the submission of the suffrage amendment by this session of Congress; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of J. E. C. Colt, of Bristol, R. I., urging passage of Federal amendment for woman suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of Mary B. Anthony, Elizabeth G. Hale, E. B. Hale, Ruth A. Haskell, Frank Cale, E. C. Hodge, Alice A. Daggett, Martha B. Willson, Harriet I. Roworth, Katherine Johnson, Lucia K. Whitman, Louise C. Wheaton, Katherine H. Austin, Amey L. Wilson, Mary Schofield, Mrs. Anne L. Willson, Mary E. Carpenter, all of Providence, in the State of Rhode Island, favoring passage of Federal amendment for woman suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of Woman's branch of the Socialist Party of Rhode Island, favoring passage of Federal amendment for woman suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of Mary S. Packard, of Centerville, R. I., favoring passage of Federal amendment for woman suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, resolution of Smithfield (R. I.) Equal Suffrage League, urging passage of Federal amendment for woman suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of J. F. Archibald, of Providence, R. I., urging passage of Federal amendment for woman suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Rhode Island, favoring passage of Federal amendment for woman suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Letters and telegrams from 18 men and women of Maryland, urging a favorable vote on the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, letters and telegrams from four men and women of the State of Maryland, protesting against the suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of Guy M. Eyttings, requesting support for the Chamberlain bill for universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUNDEEN: Petition of a group of college alumnae, by Mrs. Bertha C. Moeller, secretary of the Woman's Party of Minnesota, urging the passage of the Susan B. Anthony amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of the City Council of Minneapolis, Minn., requesting Congress to enact a law providing for the punishment of those found guilty of impeding or interfering with the United States Government in the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Electric Short Line Railway Co., D. E. K. Hunter, general manager, Minneapolis, Minn., urging governmental action for the relief of intrastate railroads; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. MAHER: Resolutions of the Bronx Board of Trade and of the Board of Aldermen of the City of New York, protesting against the discontinuance of the pneumatic-tube mail service in that city; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolutions of the American Federation of Labor, protesting against the excessive rates for second-class matter in the war-revenue law, and recommending that the law be amended by eliminating that section; to the Committee on the Post Office and Public Roads.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of E. B. Hale and 16 other citizens of Providence, R. I., favoring the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, a resolution by the Newport County Equal Suffrage League, urging a vote in favor of the suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of the Towle Maple Products Co., St. Paul, Minn., urging bill for the payment of Federal taxes in installments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of George N. Morgan Post, No. 4, Department of Minnesota, Grand Army of the Republic, Minneapolis, Minn., favoring bill increasing pensions of old soldiers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of sundry citizens of New Haven County, Conn., favoring the submission of the Federal suffrage amendment to the States; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, a petition of Ellen Strong Bartlett and others, protesting against the adoption of the woman-suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Resolutions of the City Council of Colorado Springs, Colo., favoring the suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, resolution of the City Federation, representing 300 women of Colorado Springs, Colo., favoring the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. WATSON of Virginia: Petition of sundry citizens of Mecklenburg County, Va., in favor of the woman suffrage constitutional amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Petersburg, Va., favoring the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, January 11, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we bless Thee for the assurance of Thy presence with us as a nation and Thy guidance—an assurance that keeps us calm under provocation such as never before tried a nation in the history of the world. We pray that Thou wilt still abide with us with the constant ministry of Thy Spirit, and while our spirits are unconquerable and we move forward in the midst of the conflict of the world yet may there be calm and peace in our hearts because of our oneness of life and purpose with Thee. Guide us this day in the discharge of our duties. For Christ's sake. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 200) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. JAMES. I present a resolution adopted unanimously by the Kentucky Senate approving the course pursued by President Wilson and the administration in attempting to stamp out autocracy and to use every effort to conserve that the men of this Nation now in the trenches can be protected while fighting for the cause of democracy. I ask that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution is as follows:

SENATE COMMENDS WILSON—RESOLUTION INTRODUCED BY JAY W. HARLAN
ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY.

FRANKFORT, KY., January 8.

Patriotism was the keynote of the opening session of the Kentucky Senate this afternoon and each mention of the great conflict in which this country is engaged with the European allies was received with profound respect by the members of the body and those who filled the gallery. By a unanimous vote of the entire membership the senate went on record, approving the course pursued by President Woodrow Wilson and the Democratic administration in attempting to stamp out autocracy and to use every effort to conserve that the men of this Nation now in the trenches can be protected while fighting for the cause of democracy.

The resolution commending the President was offered by Jay W. Harlan, of Boyle County, and was adopted by a rising vote. Following is the resolution in full:

"Whereas our Nation has championed the cause of justice, humanity, and democracy, and we have taken up arms in defense of the priceless heritage won for and devised to us by our forefathers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, in session assembled:

"First. That we most highly commend our beloved and esteemed President, Woodrow Wilson, and his administration for their wise and patriotic decisions and actions in handling the many perplexing problems that have arisen since their incumbency pertaining to our national integrity and interest; that we assure him and them that no true American can deny the justice of our national position in the present conflict between democracy and autocracy, humanity and barbarism, liberty and oppression; that we assure the President, his administration, and the Nation that we heartily indorse and will unqualifiedly support our present international position in this conflict.

"Second. That we make the welfare of our Nation the guiding motive in this present session, sacrificing all individual ambitions, political or factional prejudices, and will work and cooperate solely for the good of our Nation and State.

"Third. That we do now call upon every citizen of this Commonwealth to comply with all requests and suggestions made by our national administration in order to conserve our resources and strengthen our position.

"Fourth. That we unqualifiedly and severely condemn any whose action or desire is contrary to the interest of our common cause, and call upon all true Kentuckians to see that such a disloyal resident is awarded his just deserts.

"Fifth. That we do now express to the men of our State and Nation, who have already sacrificed all to take up arms in the defense of our country and the principles of democracy, humanity, and justice, our highest admiration and respect.

"Sixth. That a copy of these resolutions be spread upon the journal of this senate; that a copy be furnished to the President of the United States; and a copy to the press."

Mr. JAMES. I have received petitions signed by a large number of citizens of Montgomery County and Allen County, in the State of Kentucky, praying for the immediate submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, in order that the women of the United States may become the political equals of those of Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and the Scandinavian countries. I ask that the petitions be received and lie on the table, the joint resolution having been reported from the committee and is now on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petitions will lie on the table.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of Appomattox Post, No. 72, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Minnesota, of Minneapolis, Minn., and a petition of McIntyre Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Minnesota, of Austin, Minn., praying for an increase in the pensions of veterans of the Civil War, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wadena County, Minn., and a petition of sundry citizens of Hennepin County, Minn., praying for the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Commercial Club of West Duluth, Minn., favoring Federal control of prices of all cereals used as food during the period of the war, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the City Council of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the punishment of those found guilty of interfering with the Government in the prosecution of the war, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the congregations of sundry churches of Brownsdale, Minn., favoring prohibition dur-

ing the war and pledging loyalty to the country, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SHERMAN. I present resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of Lithuanians, held in the city of Chicago, Ill., which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. LAWRENCE Y. SHERMAN,
United States Senate:

During the mass meeting of the Lithuanian people in Chicago, Ill., held January 1, 1918, under the auspices of the Lithuanian national fund, after the addresses made by Dr. J. J. Bielskis, Lithuanian representative at Washington, D. C.; Rev. Vaidunas, rector of St. George's Parish; Rev. Kemesis and Mr. Zoldakas, editors of the Lithuanian Daily Draugas, the following resolutions were adopted:

"Whereas the aggression and outrages of the autocracy against liberty of the people forced the United States to take arms to defend the peoples' rights on land and sea;

"Whereas the United States, being morally, physically, and materially one of the most powerful countries, is able of accomplishing great things in this undertaking;

"Whereas during this war small nations in Europe have suffered the most and some of the countries have been entirely devastated by ruthless militarism;

"Whereas Lithuania, on the eastern battle front, has for three years served as a battle field, having contributed also half a million of her sons for the allied armies, taking thereby an active part in the war for liberty and justice;

"Whereas the much appreciated words of President Wilson in the recent note to Russia, and also the proclaimed principle of nationalities by the allies, assure restoration of political liberty to the smaller nations;

"Whereas the claims of the nations could be considered as just only when they are presented to the peace congress by the authorized representatives of those nations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Lithuanians of the State of Illinois, having migrated from our native land of Lithuania to this land of liberty, and ever pledging our loyalty to this, our adopted country, sincerely believing in and living up to the principles of the United States of America, being nevertheless in sympathy with our brethren in Lithuania bearing the heavy yoke of autocracy:

"1. We appeal to the Congress of the United States, through the representatives of our State, that the Congress of the United States, in discussing peace terms, include the demand for the restoration of the political independence of Lithuania.

"2. That the Government of the United States support the rights of all nations participating or affected in this war, be they large or small.

"3. That these rights can only be satisfactorily supported by considering just claims when presented by the representatives of such nations.

"4. We earnestly pray and implore the representatives of our State in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States Congress to bring to pass the above measure.

"Be it further

Resolved, That Dr. J. J. Bielskis be, and he hereby is, empowered and instructed to present a copy of these resolutions to the representatives of the State of Illinois in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States Congress at Washington, D. C."

MATHEW E. ZOLDAKAS, President.
VINCENT W. RUTKAUSKAS, Secretary.

Subscribed and sworn before me, Charles Z. Urnich, notary public, of Cook County, Ill., this 2d day of January, 1918.

[SEAL.]

CHARLES Z. URNICH, Notary Public.

Mr. RANDELL presented a petition of Ouachita Parish, Louisiana Council of Defense, relative to the public utterances of the Senator from Wisconsin, Hon. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. PHELAN presented a memorial of the Trades and Labor Council of Vallejo, Cal., remonstrating against the proposed importation of Chinese or Japanese coolie laborers into California, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the California Federation of Women's Clubs, praying for the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I present resolutions adopted at a meeting of the Suffrage Club of Mitchell, S. Dak., which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions adopted at meeting of Mitchell Suffrage Club, December 3, 1917.

Resolved, That this meeting ask President Wilson and the Democratic administration to support the Susan B. Anthony amendment by making it an administration measure and securing its passage this session of Congress, when the Government is calling upon the women of the Nation to assist in bearing the burdens of war. Be it also

Resolved, That this meeting call upon Congress to pass at once the Federal suffrage amendment, establishing at home that democracy for which the men of this country have been called to fight abroad. Be it also

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President; the Vice President; Speaker CHAMP CLARK; Senator THOMAS MARTIN, Democratic leader of the Senate; Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN, Democratic leader of the House of Representatives; Hon. FREDERICK H. GILLET, Republican leader; and to our Senators and Representatives.

(Signed)

Mrs. MYRA P. WELLER,
Mrs. BESSIE BISHOP,
Mrs. O. E. CASSEM,
Mrs. ELLEN GREGORY,
Officers Mitchell Suffrage Club.

PROPOSED RAILROAD LEGISLATION.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I send to the desk a telegram, addressed to the Vice President, which has been handed to me and which I desire to have read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will read it.

The Secretary read the telegram, as follows:

TRENTON, N. J., January 7, 1918.

HON. THOMAS R. MARSHALL:

As president of Council of States on Taxation, I respectfully draw your attention to the importance that any congressional action re governmental railroad control does not interfere with existing methods or privileges of individual States and local units of taxation on railroads, property or receipts, at the present time. This, in many States, constitutes a large portion of State revenue, and to amend in any form would greatly embarrass many States, necessitating new methods of taxation, which at this time would be most burdensome and unfortunate.

WALTER E. EDGE, Governor.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, in connection with the communication just read, I desire to ask that the bill introduced by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] upon this subject be printed in full in the RECORD. I know it was his purpose to ask that that be done, but it seems not to have been printed. There is a desire from all over the United States for copies of the bill, and I think printing in the RECORD would afford the best opportunity for general familiarity with it, and it will also make it easy for us to telegraph inquirers who desire to see it that by turning to a certain number of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD they can find it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill, introduced by Mr. SMITH of South Carolina January 4, 1918, is as follows:

A bill (S. 3385) to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the President, having in a time of war taken over the possession, use, and control (called herein Federal control) of certain systems of transportation (called herein carriers) is hereby authorized to agree with and to guarantee to any such carrier that during the period of such Federal control it shall receive as its just compensation an income at an annual rate equivalent as nearly as may be to its average net railway operating income for the three years ending June 30, 1917 (called herein standard return); said net railway operating income for the purposes of this act shall, as to carriers making returns to the Interstate Commerce Commission, be computed from such returns, excluding, however, debits and credits arising from the accounts called in the monthly returns leased road rents and miscellaneous rents: *Provided, however,* That no Federal taxes in excess of taxes assessed during the year ending June 30, 1917, shall be charged against revenue in computing such standard return. Any net railway operating income in excess of such standard return shall be the property of the United States. The amount of such standard return as accruing during said period of three years shall be determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the certificate of said commission as to the amount of said net railway operating income shall, for the purpose of such agreement and guaranty, be taken as final and conclusive.

During the period of such Federal control adequate depreciation and maintenance of the properties of the carriers shall be included as a part of the operating expenses or provided through a reserve fund, in accordance with such principles and rules as shall be determined by the President.

SEC. 2. That if no such agreement is made, the President may nevertheless pay or cause to be paid to any carrier while under Federal control an amount not exceeding 90 per cent of such standard return, remitting such carrier to its legal rights in the Court of Claims for any balance claimed; and any amount thereafter found due above the amount paid shall bear interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum; and any excess amount paid hereunder shall be recoverable by the United States, with interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum.

SEC. 3. That any claim for just compensation not adjusted as provided in section 1 shall be submitted to a board of three auditors appointed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, members of which and of the official force thereof being eligible for service as such auditors, but without additional compensation therefor. Said auditors shall give a full hearing to such carrier and to the United States and shall report to the President the amount due such carrier as just compensation; a sum not exceeding the amount so reported may be agreed upon by the President and such carrier. Failing such an agreement, either the United States or such carrier may file a petition in the Court of Claims for the purpose of final ascertainment of

the amount of such just compensation, and in the proceedings in said court the report of said auditors shall be prima facie evidence of the facts therein stated. The just compensation of any carrier under Federal control not making returns to the Interstate Commerce Commission shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of this section.

SEC. 4. That the return of any carrier shall be increased by an amount reckoned at a rate per centum to be fixed by the President upon the cost of any additions and improvements made while under Federal control with the approval of the President to the property of any carrier and paid for by such carrier from its own capital or surplus; and by an amount equal to the rate accruing to the United States upon any advances made to such carrier for the cost of such additions and improvements as provided in section 6 hereof.

SEC. 5. That no carrier while under Federal control shall, without the prior approval of the President, declare or pay any dividend in excess of its regular rate of dividends during the three years ending June 30, 1917: *Provided, however,* That such carriers as have paid no regular dividends or no dividends during said period, may, with the prior approval of the President, pay dividends at such rate as the President may determine.

SEC. 6. That the sum of \$500,000,000 is hereby appropriated out of the Public Treasury from any funds not otherwise appropriated, which, together with any funds available from any excess earnings of said carriers, may be used by the President as a revolving fund for the purpose of paying the expenses of the Federal control, and any deficit of any carrier below such standard or ascertained return, and to provide terminals, improvements, engines, rolling stock, and other necessary equipment, such terminals, improvements, and equipment to be used and accounted for as the President may direct, and to be disposed of as Congress may hereafter by law provide.

The President may also, on or in connection with the property of any carrier, make or order any carrier to make any additions and improvements necessary or desirable for war purposes or in the public interest. He may from said revolving fund advance to such carrier all or any part of the expense of such additions and improvements so ordered and constructed by such carrier or by the President, such advances to be charged against such carrier and to bear interest at such rate and be payable on such terms as may be determined by the President, to the end that the United States may be fully reimbursed for any sums so advanced.

Any loss claimed to accrue to any carrier by reason of any such additions or improvements so ordered and constructed may be determined by agreement between the President and such carrier; failing such agreement the amount of such loss shall be ascertained as provided in section 3 hereof.

From said revolving fund the President may expend such an amount as he may deem necessary or desirable for the purchase, construction, or utilization, and operation of boats, barges, tugs, and other transportation facilities on the inland and coastwise waterways, and may in the acquisition, operation, and use of such facilities create or employ such agencies and enter into such contracts and agreements as he shall deem in the public interest.

SEC. 7. That for the purpose of providing funds requisite for maturing obligations or for other legal and proper expenditures, or for reorganizing railroads in receivership, carriers may, during the period of Federal control, issue such bonds, notes, equipment trust certificates, stock and other forms of securities, secured or unsecured by mortgage, as the President may approve as consistent with the public interest. The President may purchase for the United States all or any part of such securities at prices not exceeding par, and may sell such securities whenever in his judgment it is desirable at prices not less than the cost thereof; any sums available from the revolving fund provided in section 6 may be used for such purchases.

SEC. 8. That the President may execute any of the powers herein and heretofore granted him with relation to Federal control through such agencies as he may determine, and may fix the reasonable compensation for the performance of services in connection therewith; and may utilize the personnel and facilities of the Interstate Commerce Commission and call upon members of such commission, or any of its employees, or employees of any department of the Government for such services as he may deem expedient. No such Federal official or employee shall receive any additional compensation for such services.

SEC. 9. That the President is hereby authorized while carriers are under Federal control, to direct that the Federal workmen's compensation act of September, 1916, shall be extended so as to apply to carrier employees, on such terms and conditions as will

give due consideration to remedies available under State compensation laws or otherwise.

SEC. 10. That nothing herein contained shall be construed as modifying or restricting the powers heretofore conferred upon the President to take possession and assume control of any or all systems of transportation; and the President, in addition to the powers conferred by this act, shall have, and is hereby given, such other and further powers necessary or appropriate to give effect to the powers herein and heretofore conferred.

SEC. 11. That carriers while under Federal control shall, in so far as is not inconsistent therewith, or with the provisions of this act, or any other act applicable to such Federal control, or with any order of the President, be subject to all laws and liabilities as common carriers; and suits may be brought by and against such carriers and judgments rendered as now provided by law: *Provided, however,* That except with the written assent of the President no attachment shall be levied by mesne process or on execution on or against any of the property used by any such carrier in the performance of its duties as a common carrier.

SEC. 12. That every person or corporation, whether carrier or shipper, or any receiver, trustee, lessee, agent, or person acting for or employed by a carrier or shipper, or other person, who shall knowingly violate or fail to observe any of the provisions of this act, or shall knowingly interfere with or impede the possession, use, operation, or control of any railroad property, railroad, or transportation system hitherto or hereafter taken over by the President, or shall violate any of the provisions of any order or regulation made in pursuance of this act, or of any other act concerning such possession, use, operation, or control, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than \$5,000, or, if a person, by imprisonment for not more than two years, or both. Each independent transaction constituting a violation of, or a failure to observe, any of the provisions of this act, or any order entered in pursuance hereof, shall constitute a separate offense. For the taking or conversion to his own use or the embezzlement of money or property derived from or used in connection with the possession, use, or operation of said railroads or transportation systems, the criminal statutes of the United States, as well as the criminal statutes of the various States where applicable, shall apply to all officers, agents, and employees engaged in said railroad and transportation service while the same is under Federal control, to the same extent as to persons employed in the regular service of the United States. Prosecutions for violations of this act or of any order entered hereunder, shall be in the district courts of the United States, under the direction of the Attorney General, in accordance with the procedure for the collection and imposing of fines and penalties now existing in said courts.

SEC. 13. That the Federal control of transportation systems herein and heretofore provided for shall continue for and during the period of the war and until Congress shall thereafter order otherwise.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 3462) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue to defray war expenses, and for other purposes," approved October 3, 1917; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FERNALD:

A bill (S. 3463) granting an increase of pension to Chester S. Pease (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3464) granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. Gammon (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3465) granting an increase of pension to Granville Fernald (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3466) granting a pension to Cora W. Merryman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RANSEDELL:

A bill (S. 3467) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in favor of Elizabeth White, administratrix of the estate of Samuel N. White, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 3468) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Holton (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 3469) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products," approved August 10, 1917; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

NAVAL OIL SUPPLY.

Mr. SWANSON. I introduce a bill to further provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States with respect to the production, use, and conservation of oil and gas in naval petroleum reserves, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that it be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. SMOOT. I object to the bill being referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The absence of a quorum is suggested, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Harding	McKellar	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Hardwick	McLean	Smith, Md.
Borah	Hitchcock	McNary	Smoot
Calder	James	Martin	Stone
Culberson	Johnson, Cal.	Nelson	Sutherland
Curtis	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Swanson
Fernald	Jones, Wash.	Poin Dexter	Thomas
Fletcher	Kenyon	Robinson	Tillman
Frelinghuysen	King	Saulsbury	Townsend
Gallinger	Knox	Shafroth	Trammell
Gronna	La Follette	Sheppard	Vardaman
Hale	Lewis	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
	McCumber		Wolcott

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I desire to state that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is unavoidably detained from the Chamber on official business.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wish to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF], is absent on account of illness.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. HUGHES] is unavoidably absent owing to illness.

Mr. LEWIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON] is detained on important public business.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], is detained on account of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-two Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. SWANSON. I have made a motion that the bill I introduce be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. It is a bill to permit the Government to operate for oil the naval reserve lands that have been set aside for that purpose. I will state in this connection that the lands were withdrawn from public entry and taken out of the public domain.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Has the bill been read to the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has been introduced by the Senator from Virginia and a motion made to refer it to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. THOMAS. When it is reported at the desk I desire to object under the rule to its consideration to-day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion to refer it to the committee.

Mr. SWANSON. I make that motion.

Mr. THOMAS. Under Rule XIV—

Whenever a bill or joint resolution shall be offered, its introduction shall, if objected to, be postponed for one day.

My reason for making the objection is that when we adjourned yesterday it was understood that two arguments, or perhaps three, would be offered upon the unfinished business to-day, provided that the chairman of the Committee on Printing would consent to its withdrawal at that time. This motion is going to involve a great deal of controversy, and if it comes on to-day it will be impossible to carry out the understanding with regard to the proceeding upon the pending business. Therefore, under Rule XIV, I object to its introduction to-day and ask that it go over.

Mr. SWANSON. It must go over under the rule, if objection is made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will go over for one day.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the bill be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. SWANSON. I make the request that it be printed and come up to-morrow.

Mr. TILLMAN. Printed in the Record?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to know whether the request is that the bill be printed in the Record.

Mr. SWANSON. I did not make that request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Do I understand that there was a request that the bill be printed in the Record?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There was none.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. There would be no use to print it in the RECORD.

THE PHILIPPINE SCOUTS.

Mr. OWEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2933) for the relief of the Philippine Scouts, which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICES AND POST ROADS.

Mr. BANKHEAD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 180), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized during the Sixty-fifth Congress to send for books and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a price not to exceed \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before the said committee; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate; and the expense thereof shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

THE PRESIDENT'S PEACE POLICY.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I tender a resolution and ask that it be read and lie on the table after reading, not to be referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 181), as follows:

Whereas the Senators of the United States Senate, anxious for a just peace between the contending nations now at war in Europe, and also for peace between the United States and the world, and particularly between the United States and the German Empire; and Whereas the Senate is advised as to the terms which have been stated and expressed to the Congress of the United States by the President of the United States, upon which the United States recommends peace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That for the purpose of aiding the peace of all belligerents the Senate approves the course of the President of the United States in presenting with definiteness and in detail the terms upon which peace could be had; and

Resolved further, That the Senate approves the statement of the President as presented by him in his message to Congress of January 9, 1918; and

Resolved further, That the Senate will cooperate with the President in every way consistent with its duty to the public to obtain the acceptance of the terms presented by the President, or such other terms as will serve the objects set forth by the President, as will bring peace consistent with the welfare of the United States and justice to the contending parties.

Mr. LEWIS. I ask that the resolution for the present lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That action will be taken.

CONSIDERATION OF TREATIES.

Mr. BORAH. I ask that Senate resolution 178, coming over from yesterday, be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. BORAH on the 9th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be, and the same is hereby, directed to prepare a revision of the rules of the Senate relating to the consideration of treaties so as to provide that all treaties hereafter shall be considered in the open executive sessions of the Senate, and, when such revision is so prepared, to report the same to the Senate for its consideration.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I have no desire to discuss this matter; particularly, I have no desire to discuss the merits of the proposed change in the rules. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], however, has raised a point of order upon which, if he desires to press it, I may have something to say.

Mr. STONE. What is the point of order?

Mr. BORAH. The point of order was that I had not proceeded to amend the rules in accordance with the rules; that I should have given notice, and so forth. My contention is that this procedure does not come under the provision of the Senate rules at all; but I do not know whether or not the Senator desires to press the point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I did not formally make the point of order; I suggested the point of order after objection had been made to the immediate consideration of the resolution, and it went over.

I myself do not believe that the Senator has followed the mode provided by the rules for amending the rules. I think that Rule XL clearly contemplates a written notice pointing out the rule to be changed and specifying the exact change that is to be made, which must lie over a day. Then I think the rule contemplates the formal presentation from the floor of the proposed changes. It is, however, true that the Senate has had this subject up several times. It has been ruled by the Senate that the presentation of an amendment to the rules without

notice, if it lie over a day, is a compliance with the rule; it has also been held by the Senate that such a course was not a compliance with the rule.

My real objection, not so much to this particular resolution, but generally, is that I should vastly prefer that a Senator who wanted something done should himself prepare it than that he should by resolution call upon a committee on which I am serving to prepare it for him.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do.

Mr. BORAH. I shall be very glad if this resolution goes to the committee to prepare what I consider ought to be the revision of the rule, and submit it to the committee for its consideration and report. I will take upon myself, as I am the mover of the resolution, to do the work, and I hope that when it is done it will be satisfactory to the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Well, the committee, no doubt, could report favorably or unfavorably upon it.

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not understand that the resolution commits the committee as to what report it shall make upon the subject, but that it only requires the committee to prepare an amendment to the rules for the Senator from Idaho. It provides that the Rules Committee shall prepare an amendment to the rules along the lines that he desires to be considered and to report it to the Senate, favorably or unfavorably. I know the Senator from Idaho can prepare it certainly as well as can the committee, and I do not understand why he failed himself to prepare and present it in the usual way. With this statement, so far as I am concerned, I do not object.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I do not agree with the Senator from Georgia that under this resolution the committee can report it unfavorably. The committee is "directed to prepare a revision of the rules of the Senate relating to the consideration of treaties, so as to provide that all treaties hereafter shall be considered in open executive sessions of the Senate, and when such revision is so prepared, to report the same to the Senate for its consideration."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The resolution does not say "report it favorably."

Mr. GALLINGER. It does not.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We can prepare it and present it with an unfavorable report.

Mr. GALLINGER. I differ from the Senator in that, because, to my mind, it is a specific direction to the committee to prepare a certain thing and to report it to the Senate. If it is to be reported adversely, it is not providing for a change of the rules of the Senate so as to have treaties considered in open executive session at all. I really think, as first suggested by the Senator from Georgia, that the Senator from Idaho, who is greatly interested in this matter, should himself prepare whatever he has in mind and submit it to the committee for its consideration, or ask for its immediate consideration by the Senate. I very likely would not agree favorably to report a resolution providing that all treaties should be considered in open executive session, and yet I am commanded by this resolution to agree with other members of the committee to make such a report. I think the resolution is unfortunately worded.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, this resolution does not, in my judgment, with all respect to the Senator's opinion, do anything of the kind. It was specifically drawn so as not to do anything of that kind. I desire to bring before the Senate a report of the committee revising the rules, without asking for a commitment from the committee as to whether it was favorable or unfavorable. I specifically state that after the report is made providing for these changes that it is to be reported to the Senate for its consideration. I do not understand at all that that would necessitate the Senator from New Hampshire coinciding with my view of the matter in order to make this revision and report it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I still hold to that view, and I move to refer the resolution to the Committee on Rules for its consideration.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, just a word. I suppose, of course, that this resolution will go to the Committee on Rules—

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. STONE. As it concerns a rule for the government of the body. But it also concerns, in a very serious and far-reaching way, the diplomatic relations between this country and other countries as related to treaties. I am not clear how to get at it, but I believe whenever the Committee on Rules reports, if it reports a rule of this general kind suggested, I shall move that in some way it be referred to the Committee on

Foreign Relations for consideration there and a report upon the wisdom or expediency of the change in the rules so as to provide for the consideration of all treaties in the open sessions of the Senate.

I wish merely to make the suggestion that it seems to me, in a matter of such grave consequence, which involves such a wide departure from the course that has been followed in our whole history, it at least in some way ought to have the authoritative consideration of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, when the committee reports back the provision, the Senator would doubtless move to refer it to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I do not know that I would object to have it so considered before final action by the Senate. What I desire now is to get a report before the Senate for its consideration. Whether to adopt it or refer it to the Foreign Relations Committee will be determined at that time.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, if this resolution goes to the Committee on Rules, as similar resolutions usually do, the committee will then take it up and make a report on the resolution. There is no doubt that we will get a report one way or another. I think it ought to go to the committee, and I think the Senator ought to agree to that.

Mr. BORAH. I am sending it to the committee, Mr. President.

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, no; the Senator is sending it to the committee with directions.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator does not move to strike out anything in the resolution, does he?

Mr. GALLINGER. No; but I want the committee to consider the resolution in its present form, without any direction on the part of the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire to submit to a ruling of the Chair upon the point of order, if any has been made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There has been no point of order made, according to the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. BORAH. Then I ask for the adoption of the resolution. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] to refer the pending resolution to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BORAH. Now, Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Suppose the resolution is referred to the Committee on Rules, what will be the difference in its status than if it were adopted by the Senate directing the committee to report?

Mr. KENYON. It would be buried.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The committee might use its discretion in regard to its action.

Mr. GALLINGER. It would not go to the committee with a direction; it would go there for its consideration.

Mr. BORAH. If that is the program, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I call for a vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll, the absence of a quorum being suggested.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nelson	Smoot
Beckham	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Stone
Borah	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Swanson
Calder	Kenyon	Phelan	Thomas
Culberson	King	Polindexter	Tillman
Curtis	Kirby	Ransdell	Townsend
Fernald	Knox	Robinson	Trammell
France	La Follette	Saulsbury	Underwood
Gallinger	Lewis	Shafroth	Vardaman
Gerry	McCumber	Sheppard	Warren
Hale	McKellar	Sherman	Watson
Harding	McLean	Simmons	Williams
Hardwick	McNary	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott
James	Martin	Smith, Ga.	
Johnson, Cal.	Myers	Smith, S. C.	

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], is detained on account of illness.

Mr. LEWIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] is detained on official business.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Michigan] and his pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. MYERS. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. WALSH] is still necessarily detained from the Senate by illness. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-eight Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I ask unanimous consent that the members of the Interstate Commerce Committee be allowed to sit in committee during the sessions of the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. There is another matter before the Senate now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The request of the Senator from South Carolina is for unanimous consent. Is there objection?

Mr. GALLINGER. I object until the pending matter is disposed of.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I withdraw my motion, and submit the amendment which I send to the desk as a substitute for the resolution submitted by the Senator from Idaho. I feel assured there will be no objection on the part of the Senator himself to the proposed substitute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire as a substitute for the resolution of the Senator from Idaho.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of the resolution submitted by Mr. BORAH, Mr. GALLINGER submits the following:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be, and the same is hereby, directed to consider the advisability of preparing a revision of the rules of the Senate relating to the consideration of treaties, with a view to providing that all treaties hereafter shall be considered in the open executive sessions of the Senate, report to be made to the Senate at an early day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Chair understand that the mover of the resolution accepts the substitute?

Mr. BORAH. I think I shall, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire as a substitute for the original resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I ask unanimous consent that the members of the Interstate Commerce Committee may be permitted to sit during the sessions of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the request is granted.

COST OF OFFICERS' UNIFORMS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, before the morning business is closed I desire to refer for a moment to the bill which I introduced a few days ago providing that the uniforms of officers of the Army should be furnished to them by the Government. I have a letter from the Secretary of War in answer to one which I wrote December 26 relating to this matter, in which he says:

Army regulations provide for sales only when supplies are not required for issue to enlisted men, and it has been necessary to apply these regulations very rigidly, owing to the present difficulty of procuring clothing and equipage for enlisted men. Sales of clothing and equipage supplies to officers have therefore been temporarily suspended.

A board of officers of which Gen. Baker is president is now considering this question with a view to establishment of purchases either through post exchanges or cooperative stores.

Mr. President, I do not claim to know very much about this matter, but it does occur to me that the simple, proper, and direct course for the Government to take would be to put itself in a position where it can take all this material that is available. Apparently, there is an abundance of material in private establishments for furnishing these uniforms. The Government can commandeer that and take it, and if the Government would arrange to deal with the wholesale manufacturers of these goods it would have on hand all the time ample supplies to furnish the officers with the goods at wholesale or cost prices, just as it furnishes the goods for the private soldiers.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. Since the Senator has studied this matter, I should like to know his judgment about this point: Is it necessary to have additional legislation in order to give the Quartermaster Department of the Army authority to commandeer this stuff and to sell it at cost to the officers the same as it does to the private soldiers?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I doubt if it is necessary, but I will say to the Senator that I have not investigated that feature of the matter very fully. I have understood that the officers were required to buy all their uniforms.

Mr. NORRIS. I know they are.

Mr. JONES of Washington. But I see here, according to this letter of the Secretary, that apparently they have a regulation under which the officers can purchase uniforms from the Government, but that that has been suspended because of the inability of the department to get supplies. Now, if they need any authority to commandeer this stuff they ought to have it.

Mr. NORRIS. Then what does the suspension of this order mean? I take it, from the very fact that they have suspended

an order that seems to have given them the authority to supply uniforms to these officers, that they must have the authority under existing law.

Mr. JONES of Washington. They may have the authority to supply it, but not the authority to commandeer the stocks.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh!

Mr. JONES of Washington. I judge from the suspension of this regulation that they have not the authority to commandeer the stock and get control of it; so, not being able to supply both officers and men, they have suspended that regulation.

Mr. NORRIS. How do they get the men's clothing?

Mr. JONES of Washington. We make an appropriation directly for the supply for the private soldiers. I do not think we do for the officers. I think that is what we ought to do, however.

Mr. NORRIS. That may explain it; but if that is true probably the only thing necessary is for us to make an appropriation.

Mr. JONES of Washington. An ample appropriation—I think so.

Mr. WARREN rose.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator from Wyoming probably can give us the facts more accurately.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Washington if there is any complaint on the part of the officers themselves in regard to this matter?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, yes. I made some statements on that subject here the other day about the outrageous prices they are having to pay for their uniforms.

Mr. WARREN. I did not hear them.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will say that this morning I got a letter from an officer stating that he had to pay \$18 or \$20 for a pair of breeches.

Mr. WARREN. There never has been any particular attention paid by the Government to the purchase of clothing and equipment by the officers, provided the uniforms were according to regulations, because that is their own matter; but the Government has usually held itself in readiness to sell to officers or men any of the equipment that it had at cost, or perhaps cost, plus a small margin to cover contingencies.

Mr. NORRIS. They have not been doing that lately.

Mr. WARREN. That may be, while they are furnishing the men, because in the case of the enlisted men clothing is a part of their compensation. The Government is under obligation to furnish that.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I understand that.

Mr. WARREN. The officers, on the other hand, take their own responsibility as to clothing, and always have done so; and very seldom in this part of the country have they bought of the Government. They usually buy directly from the different tailors, as civilians do.

Mr. NORRIS. As I understand, it is necessary for these officers to buy from private parties if the Government will not sell to them.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is shown by the letter from the Secretary.

Mr. NORRIS. That is shown not only by the letter but by many other complaints.

Mr. WARREN. It does not require any new legislation, unless the Senator expects the Government to furnish free the uniforms to the officers. I saw some notice in the paper of the introduction of a bill on that subject. That, of course, would require legislation; but in my judgment no legislation is necessary about selling them the material, and I think there will be no hesitancy about selling it just as soon as this particular crisis is past, when they once get the private soldiers uniformed.

Mr. NORRIS. By that time the officers also will have purchased all their uniforms and that will not be of much value to them.

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; the profiteers will have gotten their profit.

Mr. NORRIS. The profiteers will have reaped all the benefit and supplied them with the clothing.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think there will be very few officers who, after examining the cloth that is furnished by our Government now for overcoats for the soldiers, will ask to have the privilege of buying that class of cloth. I consider it a very, very poor product and I do not believe many officers are going to buy that kind of cloth. I have noticed that the overcoats for officers are made of cloth that must have come from some different mill, or, if from the same mill, that is made entirely differently from the cloth that is made into overcoats worn by private soldiers. The officers' cloth is worth

twice as much as that worn by the privates. It is made of the very finest of wool. It is finished as the overcoats used to be finished, whereas the overcoating that is worn by the privates—and I have examined many of them—is loaded with shoddy just as much as it is possible to load a thread and make it so that it will hold to be woven into cloth.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Does the Senator think that ought to be permitted?

Mr. SMOOT. That can not be regulated by law. The only thing I am calling attention to is that regardless of any law we pass now, I do not believe that the officers of the United States would buy that kind of cloth for an overcoat.

Mr. JONES of Washington. There is a provision in the bill I have introduced that the quality of these uniforms shall be prescribed by the department, and that the quality for all officers of the same rank shall be exactly the same. I would not permit an officer of the Army to have any say about the character of the uniform that he shall wear. We should direct that every officer of the same rank shall wear the same sort of uniform, just as we require privates to wear the same sort of uniform. Let us prescribe what the uniform of a colonel shall be, what the uniform of a major shall be, what the uniform of brigadier shall be, and not have it so that because one officer is wealthy he can have a uniform of a certain quality and of a certain peculiar fitness while the man who does not happen to be in the ranks of the millionaires must be satisfied, although he has the same rank, with a different kind of uniform. I take it that we can require that by law, and that the Secretary of War can prescribe regulations under which these uniforms can be properly provided.

Mr. WARREN. Now, Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. The uniform regulations already provide the kind of uniforms the officers shall wear. If they want to get all-wool cloth, or cloth that contains perhaps 10 per cent of reworked wool, undoubtedly they can do that; but as to the cut, color, and style, the law, or rather the regulations, provide what that shall be. The officers, however, have the purchases to make themselves, and if they choose they can have all wool in the goods instead of the regulation material.

Speaking of the kind of uniforms that the enlisted men wear, the evidence that is being taken in another place shows exactly the make. The standard when the war broke out permitted a small percentage of cotton in the cloth, the balance to be of virgin wool. It was found that that did not have the warmth necessary for the cold country. Of course, cotton does not give the warmth that wool does, and so it was changed to have, say, 20 per cent reworked wool and 80 per cent virgin wool. As the stress of obtaining the right kind of wool for these uniforms was on, which requires the quarter-blood grade and possibly three-eighths grade at times, they changed the standard to, I think, as much as 35 or 40 per cent reworked wool, and the balance virgin wool; so it is all wool, although part of it is reworked.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do.

Mr. CURTIS. I want to ask the Senator if he means, by "reworked wool," shoddy?

Mr. WARREN. It means the cuttings from the making of suits, and so forth. All of the off-fall is the reworked wool. Of course, we all use the name "shoddy" as applying to that as well as to other classes of material, but shoddy proper, which meets the opprobrium of everyone, is quite a different substance. It is that which has been reworked, and again and again reworked, and ground up, and so forth.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me further—

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. I have not attended the hearings to which the Senator refers, but I have read accounts of them in the newspapers, and I understand that the admission was made before the committee that shoddy was substituted for the cotton, and later on that a further reduction of the wool was made, so that the proportions are now 50 per cent wool and 50 per cent shoddy. I for one think it is an outrage that our soldiers should be clothed in that way.

Mr. WARREN. I do not believe there has been quite that percentage of shoddy. I agree with the Senator that all-virgin wool should be what we finally aim at. I should prefer to see the clothing all wool, and perhaps that will soon be brought about.

Mr. CURTIS. That is what should be brought about.

Mr. WARREN. But in the haste of supplying a million men the use of shoddy or reworked wool has crept in, and, of course, we submit to it for the time being; but undoubtedly it must have been and is the intention, and undoubtedly it will be brought about—it certainly will if the committee that is hearing this testimony has anything to do about it—that the clothing eventually will be all wool.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me a question?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator from Wyoming comes from the sheep country and is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs. Is it true, as reported in the papers, that the Secretary of War testified before that committee that some time last spring, after our declaration of war, the Western Wool Growers' Association offered to sell their entire wool output to the Government at such a price as the Government might fix, and that the Secretary of War testified that no action was taken on that offer, but that it was referred to some one, and from that person to some one else, and he did not know what was finally done about it? Is that correct?

Mr. WARREN. Not exactly that way. Since the Senator has asked the question, I will say—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I should like to add that the reason I ask the question is on account of the debate here this morning as to whether or not there is enough wool in the country to make uniforms for the soldiers and for the officers. I am very much in sympathy with the bill which has been introduced by my colleague; but if there is a shortage of wool, necessitating the use of reworked wool, or even of shoddy, which some of the subcommittees of the Council of National Defense have resorted to, we can readily understand why that would be the case if the offer of the wool people of the country was ignored when they offered to sell wool to the Government at such a price as the Government might fix.

Mr. WARREN. On the 2d or 3d day of April last the wool trade of Boston offered the Government one-half of the wool that they had on hand at the market price of that date, they believing—which was perfectly apparent to everybody—that wool must rise. That offer was considered to some extent by the Government, but there was nothing shown in the evidence as to just what action, if any, was taken on it. Later, about July, the offer was again made, and the representatives of the wool trade came over here, and they were referred to the committee on purchases, and to the particular branch of the committee that had charge of the purchases of raw material; and the answer was given at that time that there was no law for it. In the first instance, I think, the answer was that there had been no appropriation made for it.

A little later on, or about that time, representatives, not of the associated woolgrowers altogether but of those that have their headquarters in Chicago and have their large warehouses there, sent a committee here, and it met the purchase of raw materials committee, which was presided over by Mr. Baruch, and offered the wool committee its wool at any price that the Government would make, taking into consideration, of course, the then market price. The same answer was given them; but about that time, or soon afterwards—the appropriations having in the meantime become effective—the Government decided that it could buy wool, and the Navy started in first to buy it, and later the Army; so that is the story of that.

A telegram from Mr. Hagenbarth, who is the president of the National Wool Growers' Association, received within a week, gave the quantity of available wool of the world, as the association was informed, and made the statement that there was enough to provide all wools, and that it was unnecessary to use substitutes; that there was enough to provide the Army with a certain number of pounds per annum per man, which was considered the necessary equipment. But, of course, that statement did not provide for the civilian market, nor did it state what would be the fact, that to use certain grades of that wool, the finer grades, would be more expensive; but he maintained that there was enough wool in the country to clothe every soldier so far with all-woolen goods.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I have been led to wonder whether or not the fact that we happen to have so much cloth for so many officers of the Army, and that their being supplied rests very largely with the private concerns of the country, has not had a good deal to do with the fact that a good deal of shoddy is being used for the private soldiers? Is it not partly due to the fact that they have been using wool to make these fine uniform cloths for the officers?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, there is nothing in that. The proportion of that is entirely too small. They may be taking advantage in the price, but the wool used in the officers' clothes

would have a very slight effect upon the vast amount which is used for private soldiers. I do not believe there is anything in that.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have not followed this matter very closely; but in conversation with a member of the Committee on Military Affairs last evening he presented some very startling facts as developed in the hearings of the last two or three days on this question of shoddy. His statements certainly surprised me very greatly, and if there is not great haste required in the consideration of this matter I think the Senator might well have that testimony transcribed, if it has not been printed, for the information of the Senate. I will say to the Senator frankly that the statements made by that member of the committee will, I think, astonish every Member of this body if they are presented to him.

Mr. WARREN. I will say that that evidence was given in extenso, and is only being printed confidentially for the committee, and I think it is not in type yet; but it covers every angle and every line of the making of the cloth and the production of clothing. Very little has been testified about the wool growing of the world, of course, because that was not called out. The balance of it is very elaborate.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I want to ask the Senator if he considers that information that ought to be kept confidential?

Mr. WARREN. I think it is not the intention to keep it confidential.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I thought the Senator said that it was being printed in confidence.

Mr. WARREN. It is, from day to day, because there are some matters that very likely the committee will think it is better to strike out, but nothing of this kind; only matters regarding our relations with other countries, and so forth.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, yes; certainly.

Mr. WARREN. But I think it is the intention to have it all printed. That is my idea of it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. Without assuming to criticize the committee at all, the Members of the Senate outside of the committee are very anxious to get some of these reports. The presumption is that the facts stated in some of them may crystallize at some time or other into some kind of legislation in regard to these different matters. I presume there is very good reason for not hastening the printing of these hearings, but it is a great inconvenience to Members of the Senate who desire to keep in touch with the situation not to be able to have these hearings. I should like the Senator from Wyoming to carry to the committee the suggestion that we are very anxious to get them before we actually come to the consideration of those matters which grow out of the investigation, that some one ought to be put to work to revise them, if any are to be eliminated, so that that which is to be published may be published.

Mr. WARREN. I think that will follow. It looks now as if the committee is nearly closing the investigation, and as witnesses are revising their remarks, as they are doing right along, I think that will be very easily and soon accomplished.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to suggest to the Senator from Wyoming, and through him to the committee, that if the hearing is prolonged all matters that are not considered confidential ought to be printed from day to day. That course is being pursued by the Committee on Commerce that is investigating the work of the Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation; matters that are not considered confidential are printed within a day or two after the hearing is had.

I wish also to say that the suggestion of the Senator from Wyoming as to the very small proportionate part of wool needed for officers' uniforms compared with that of privates confirms me in my belief that they ought to be furnished by the Government and that the Government can very well do it along with the facilities and means that it has for furnishing private soldiers with their uniforms.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. I wish to suggest to the Senator what is undoubtedly one of the reasons why the price of officers' uniforms has gone up. I understand that upward of 2,000 commissions have been issued to officers in the Quartermaster Department. Those officers are still at large and it takes a good deal to supply them with uniforms. That undoubtedly raises the market price of officers' uniforms.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have here a statement that I received. As a general rule I pay no attention to an anonymous communication, but sometimes they state facts that can be very easily verified, and give information that may be of importance. It contains some very interesting statements which I desire to read. It purports to come from a wholesale manufacturer of cloth for uniforms. His business is in New York and he gives some very interesting information with reference to the procedure in the city of New York under which officers there can get their uniforms much more cheaply than they do elsewhere. He says:

My attention has been called to an article in to-day's issue of the Daily News-Record, of New York, quoting you to the effect that officers are being overcharged for equipment by retailers, and particularly mentioning uniforms. As my firm is one of the leading manufacturers of the country making hand-tailored uniforms for officers, as well as clothing for civilian wear, for distribution through the retailing, I am in position to know something regarding this matter that may be of interest to you and helpful in solving this problem.

That officers are being overcharged in many cases by retailers can not be denied, but in my opinion the question will by no means be solved when the Government undertakes to manufacture them, and for the following reasons:

With few exceptions, officers will not wear the grade of uniforms that are being made by the Government.

My bill takes care of that phase of the matter and requires officers to wear the uniforms prescribed by the regulations issued by the Secretary of War.

They require and insist upon high-grade fabrics, such as pure worsted serges, whipcords, etc., and they demand high-grade linings, such as alpaca, serge, or silk.

Some officers may do that, and the very fact that they do demand these things may compel officers who are not really able to buy them to try to do the same. It certainly is not conducive to a proper spirit in the Army for officers to be wearing one quality of uniform and officers of the same rank being forced by their means to wear a poorer quality or else be compelled to go beyond their means to keep up with officers in the same rank who are better able to pay for their uniforms.

They also demand a hand-tailored suit, as this is the only process of making and finishing which will produce the fit and style they want. Officers are, for the most part, men who have worn the finer grades of civilian clothes—

I leave the rest of that paragraph—

It seems to me that the quartermaster depot of New York is handling this question in a very practical way. I am informed that they are supplying to all officers who call at the depot a list of names of some 20 or 30 manufacturers of officers' equipment, and have requested these manufacturers to supply them with a price list and to deliver equipment to officers individually and collect the wholesale price from the officers, thus saving the officers the retailers' expense of doing business plus the profit. As the expense of retailers vary from 20 to 30 per cent and their ideas of profit from 25 to 40 per cent, you can readily see the saving that the New York depot is effecting for these officers who call there for equipment.

I have been present on several occasions when officers called for uniforms, presenting this list from the New York depot, and have heard their expressions of surprise at the very large savings effected in the purchase of a blouse and breeches. Uniforms of fine quality of pure wool serge are thus obtained for \$24 to \$33. Prices varying according to the weight, linings, etc. In this case officers make their own alterations where necessary, just as they would have to do were they supplied by the Quartermaster Department.

These are the same uniforms being retailed throughout the country at \$37.50 to \$55 (in some cases as high as \$65). These retail prices are beyond the control of manufacturers, as you can readily understand. May I suggest that it might be advisable for the Government to require all manufacturers of officers' equipment to file their price lists with the various depot quartermasters and to supply officers as they are now being supplied through the New York depot, or by mail.

Manufacturers would, as a patriotic duty, I am sure, be glad to render this service to the Government, although their prices are based on quantity production and handling, and it entails some extra expense to handle single garments.

If this request came from the depot quartermasters there could be no complaint on the part of the retailer to the manufacturer. Manufacturers are—

Here is rather a significant suggestion:

Manufacturers are reluctant to offer their goods to officers for fear of the loss of the retailers' trade. From observation I should say that very few officers know of this arrangement at the New York depot, as only those who call there are given this list of manufacturers.

Of course a plan followed something like that may be of benefit to the officers in localities where they have these manufacturing establishments, but there are a great many places in the country where officers must get their uniforms where these manufacturing establishments are not located. It is very significant that the wholesale manufacturers of cloth to be made into uniforms for officers of the country are afraid of disposing of it to officers individually, because of their fear of losing the trade of retailers, who seem to want to prey upon the patriotism of the men of the country who have offered their lives in its defense.

I ask that this communication may be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and I hope that something more than an investigation will be had with reference to the matter. It ought not to take very long to determine something as to what would be a wise course to take in regard to it. We are going

to have to call for thousands more of officers from the homes of the country, and prompt and definite action should be taken by the committee if any legislation is necessary, and if no further legislation is necessary the department ought to adopt a definite and clear course and do it promptly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the communication will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. The morning business is closed.

SUPPLY OF PRINT PAPER.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I ask that Senate joint resolution 101, the unfinished business, be laid before the Senate and proceeded with.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 101) to provide further for the national security and defense by insuring to the Government of the United States an adequate supply of paper at a fair price, and by insuring a supply and equitable distribution at fair prices to the industries of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, the pending question is on the amendment offered by me, which I will say I submitted after conference with the Trade Commission. I should like to have a vote upon the pending question unless some Senator desires to be heard.

Mr. HARDING. I do not think it is necessary, Mr. President, for one who makes his livelihood in the newspaper business to disavow any selfish ends in taking for the moment the news-print manufacturing side of the pending question, nor do I think it is necessary to say that circumstances are rather lacking in the inspiration one ought to have to speak on a subject of the importance of this question, but I am resolved to say a few things, in my mind, for my own conscience sake, whether I influence any vote on the pending question or not.

I venture to make these remarks because as a small publisher I have been brought in contact with the news-print problem from which the publishers of the country have suffered notably during the last year. The cost of news print is not the only mounting expense in the newspaper publication business of these days. Congress has some knowledge that it has attempted, rather ineffectually I will admit, to add to the cost of newspapers and newspaper distribution. Everything that enters into the cost account of a newspaper office has mounted up. Notably the manufacture of printer's rollers, a very essential thing in the operation of a press, and without which no newspaper could be published, has more than doubled. The metal necessary for the operation of the linotype machine, without which no modern newspaper can be published, and the metals employed in the stereotyping department of any newspaper of any considerable importance have essentially doubled in price. There was some reference made day before yesterday to the cost of ink, which most publishers are ready to testify as essential, having doubled in price. Metal type, brass rules, all the requisites of a mechanical department, have mounted up astonishingly, and yet quite in accord with the mounting price of everything else in a business era of extravagant expenditure.

I do not know how anybody, whatever his personal prejudices may be, can expect a normal cost on anything when the Government has doubled, tripled, and quadrupled its expenditures, and we are living in a perfect saturnalia of extravagance and outlay. Not only have these things in the newspaper world advanced in cost but labor has advanced, not as it reasonably ought in comparison with other things, but in accordance with increases that have been acceptable to the unions throughout the land. Then, there is the question of fuel, of power, and the innumerable things that enter into the cost of the production of a newspaper.

In passing it will be appropriate to the immediate subject under consideration to state—and I suppose it has been called to the attention of the distinguished chairman who has the joint resolution in charge—that paper generally which is uninfluenced by the so-called Paper Trust, job printing and book paper and writing paper, which are quite without the domination of the combinations which have offended in the news-print world, have gone up from 50 to 100 per cent in cost and are entering into the making of the current prices in the printing world. All these things have come to the publisher and to the printer.

I think it is fair to say that in most instances the cost has been passed along. The large newspaper publisher, the publisher of the daily paper, in many instances, has doubled his circulation price. I think the rural publisher has not added so much to the cost of his subscription rate. In many cases the increased cost has been partially compensated, if not altogether so, in an increased toll on the advertiser. The advertising

world has been familiar with the general advance in prices, and it is worth while saying that the business men, who are the larger advertisers, have been big enough to accept the situation and accept the added burden. I think it is too much to say that the increased cost has been handed along in every instance or completely covered, but there has been a fair adjustment of it, notwithstanding the extremely enormous addition to the cost of publishing in 1917.

I think a newspaper man who knows the business, who has the qualities of making a success, would very much prefer in the end to adjust his own affairs. I make bold to say at this time that I do not want the United States Government to furnish me my print paper. I want to emphasize the fact that as a Republican publisher in this era I do not want to subject myself to a Government control of my paper supply. I am not saying this in any ugly temper, but it is a fact that there is the tightest "little old" censorship of the press on in this country to-day that ever existed in the world. I voted for it and I suspect it is necessary, and I am willing to submit to it; but I am not going to be a publisher, while I can help it, and submit to the censorship on one hand and invite the Government control of my newspaper supply on the other. When I am obliged to do that I am going to join the party in power, which never forgets its partisan aspirations, no matter how much those of us on this side of the Chamber have been willing to submerge ours for the country's good. But that is quite apart from my immediate thought.

I know something about the news-print manufacturing business. I hope it is not necessary for me to say that I have neither an interest in it nor sympathy with the robbing methods that were employed by a great many large news-print manufacturers who took advantage of the war situation in this country last year, but as a buyer of news print I have experienced the varying market for a goodly number of years.

It may interest the Senator from Arizona to know that prior to the outbreak of the Spanish-American War, when we were suffering from alleged "high" prices incident to the economic policy in existence at that time, when there were ample news-print mills to meet the American demand, even so small a publisher as the company in which I am interested was able to buy its news print at \$1.65 a hundred pounds. Suddenly the Spanish-American War created a great demand for news print. It is very easy to understand that war in itself brings no new emergency to the newspaper world, but the interest in war events makes an unusual demand for the perfectly useless extra editions of the papers. News-print prices in 1898 jumped from \$1.65 a hundred to \$3 and \$4 without the slightest suggestion of a combination on the part of any of the manufacturers. It jumped because the suddenly increased demand created a panic on the part of those who were not covered in their supply by contracts, and they were obliged to enter the open or spot market and get their supply of paper at any price they could. So that sort of a situation advanced the price of news-print paper in 1898 to 3 and 4 cents per pound for the publisher whose supply had not been previously arranged for, and that sort of a market prevailed more or less until approximately a year after the war was ended. A very similar situation developed in 1917; it began in 1916.

There had previously been mounting costs in the production of news-print paper. I wonder if Senators have ever stopped to think that news-print paper is made principally from the spruce tree? We have almost denuded the American forests of spruce. One may go into Maine these days and travel over hundreds of miles where the forests have been denuded and the land, fortunately, turned into the culture of potatoes. We are getting our spruce nowadays, in the main, from Canada. Any man who has taken sufficient interest to go into the question of raw materials knows that unless we start a systematic reforestation of the spruce lands and cultivate spruce specifically for the production of paper we are going to have a famine in the original raw material which is necessary to the manufacture of news-print paper.

If it is not too much of a diversion at this point, I should like to say that the United States Government could do a far greater service for the newspapers of this country if it would give its attention to finding a substitute for the spruce trees than would be done by the passage of this legislation. One objection I have to paralyzing the production of news-print paper by Federal control is that it is going to hinder the application of American genius and American determination to find a basic source of supply for the manufacture of news-print paper. Do you suppose for a moment that any genius, that any student of this problem is going to bend his energies to such a development if he contemplates Government control of his industry? I do not. So news-print paper has been advancing in price con-

tinually because of the menace of a disappearing supply of raw material.

Quite apart from that, and properly I want to say, the cost of news-print paper was increased very largely in the last three or four years by a complete change of the labor situation. Five years ago there was scarcely a news-print paper factory in the United States that was not operating under what we call two shifts of 12 hours each. The manufacturers were persuaded by the working forces in their plants to adopt an 8-hour day and to change from two shifts of 12 hours each to three shifts of 8 hours each. It does not require very much knowledge of arithmetic to understand how much that added at one jump to the expense of paper production.

So, then, for two reasons we have had a mounting cost in the manufacture of news-print paper. As to the third reason, I am reluctant to enter into a discussion of that, because I would not for anything in the world offend the genial Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH], and I am not going to be foolish enough to attempt to interest anybody in the discussion of the political and economic side of this question; but it is a fact that the newspaper publication business in this country has far outstripped news-print paper production. That requires considerable discussion to get at the various reasons involved, but two principal reasons will offer the explanation. One was the perfection and the cheapening of the typesetting machines. Rural publishers who 20 years ago were content to send a little daily paper to press with five columns of news matter, which they had themselves set, now produce from 40 to 50 columns at little more outlay in the mechanical department; and with the improvement of the reading side of the paper they have added to their advertising account.

Papers which formerly were content to issue 8 pages now issue 16 pages. If one picks up a metropolitan paper, with which he will be familiar if he resorts to his memory, he will find that the publication which used to convey its advertising, its news, and its comments in 8, 12, or 16 pages now goes to press daily with 16, 24, 28, or 32 pages, while on Sunday—well, the average Sunday publication is so enormous that it baffles a reasonable description. All this consumes paper, and production in this country has not kept pace.

The newspaper men who might view an economic situation with a business eye would resolve to meet it with diminution of consumption. I think it is a pretty fair proposition that if there is an inadequate supply of anything in the world, if you will diminish the consumption you will adjust the situation; and the boys in the newspaper gallery can tell their publications, if they want to, that I said that there is not a newspaper in the United States of America that could not reduce its consumption of paper without taking anything away from its readers; but it has become the fashion in these United States to turn to the Government in every hour of grievance, and that is why I am talking for the moment in opposition to this joint resolution.

However, before I take up that phase of the question—meanwhile expressing my gratitude to the half dozen Senators who are good enough to sit here—I want to express a selfish reason for opposing this resolution. Perhaps some Senators will be interested in the news-print controversy. I think I know it. I do not think there is a news-print trust, I will say to the Senator from Arizona. At any rate, I never in my 30 years' experience as a publisher bought of the trust. I do know that there was a combination of large manufacturers last year, or the year before, to fix the price of news-print paper and the trade conditions under which it was sold. I think they violated the law; I think they ought to have been prosecuted; I think they ought to be brought to repentance; and I am glad there were efforts made in that direction. I quite agree with the Senator from Arizona that they robbed thousands of publishers of this country unreasonably and in an unforgivable manner. I think it is fair to say, however, in that connection—and I say it solely through a spirit of fairness—that the biggest robbers in the United States were not in the combination but were the men outside of it, who took advantage of the situation while proclaiming their independence. That is one of the inevitable things, however.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That condition will run along with a combination always.

Mr. HARDING. But this enormous robbery was made possible in 1917 by a perfect panic in the newspaper world incident to the increased demand for news print, and, without drifting into a discussion, which we will differ upon at the proper time, we have increased enormously our American consumption without keeping up our American production. Then when the strain came there was a panic to secure news-print supplies, and prices to those of the small publishing world who were not covered by

contracts were immediately advanced in some cases to an enormous figure; and it was not infrequently the case that some of us who had only informal contracts found ourselves immediately obliged to go into the "spot market" and pay according to the figure prevailing at that time. Not only that, but it is fair to say that the panic in the newspaper market was so marked and so acute and the demand was so far in excess of the supply that many a publisher who was supposedly protected by a contract found himself driven to every extremity to get a sufficient supply of paper.

I think I heard the Senator from Arizona say the other day that the big and favored publishers were able to get all that they wanted, while the little publisher here and there was robbed enormously.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. "All they needed," I think I said.

Mr. HARDING. Well, "all they needed," I will accept the correction. The Senator is not well informed on that subject. I know many large publishers in this country whose supply of paper was amply covered by the most exacting contracts who were obliged to enter the open market and buy "spot" paper at 6 and 6½ cents a pound when their contracts provided that they should have paper at 2.10 cents a pound. That was not an uncommon experience. There are various explanations for it—mainly because the United States publishing world was in a perfect panic about the shortage of the news-print supply.

I will not say that the combination which was called to the bar of justice did not have something to do with that situation, because it undoubtedly did; but the Federal Trade Commission, either late in 1916 or early in 1917, contemplating an intolerable situation in this country, called in the representatives of the larger makers of news print and began an investigation of the situation, which long before the threat of prosecution by the Department of Justice, terminated in an arrangement whereby the large purchasers, the car-lot purchasers, of news print in rolls were to be supplied at the mills of this country at 2½ cents per pound. I think any newspaper man in the United States who is fair, who contemplates the diminishing spruce forests in this country and the increased cost of production, will agree that 2½ cents per pound is a fair price for news print, however much he might wish to buy it for less. The agreement was made with the manufacturers that they would turn their contracts over to the Federal Trade Commission and, no matter how much anyone was paying beyond that, he should have his supply as apportioned by the commission at the 2½-cent rate at the mill. There were other rates adjusted to that basic price for the small consumer.

That was a very happy arrangement, and I think the newspapers of the country were glad to applaud the making of it; but before it became effective the Department of Justice availed itself of the information which had been brought out in the investigation and secured indictments against a combination of a half-dozen or more large producers in this country. That, of course, disturbed the amity of the situation. I think I violate no confidence when I say that a number of publishers in this country, including some representatives of the publishing world from Capitol Hill, went before the Trade Commission and sought to have a suspension of the criminal prosecution because the thing accomplished under the friendly arrangement was of infinitely greater advantage to the publishing world than any punishment which could be meted out. Without criticizing—perhaps one can not justly criticize the Department of Justice—the department went on with its prosecution. That upset the friendly arrangement, and throughout 1917 every man sought paper to the best advantage he could and got it where he could. Of course, much of the output had already been covered by contracts, which nothing but a friendly arrangement could abrogate, and the little publisher, who has no more important business than that which I am interested in at home, found himself assessed anywhere from ten to twenty thousand dollars because of the increased cost of paper in 1917.

Having failed in relief because of the threat of prosecution the Federal Trade Commission very properly, I think, sought again to renew a friendly arrangement for the handling of the print supply of this country; and negotiations reached such a stage that the Department of Justice, on the recommendation of the Trade Commission, agreed to accept pleas of noncontention—*nolo contendere*. I think you lawyers call it—and the imposition of nominal fines which should end the criminal litigation, and the news-print producers of the country should enter into a voluntary arrangement with the Trade Commission as to fixing the price of paper. That arrangement was made. If I correctly understood the Senator from Arizona in his remarks the other day, he said that it was made, but that they were now trying to get away from it. Am I correct?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I said I thought I saw evidences of an effort to get away from it by a recent combination of the same men.

Mr. HARDING. That clears the situation and is in conformity with the information which I have.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I should like to suggest to the Senator just at this point, merely explanatory of the Federal Trade Commission taking any hand at all in the matter, that the Senate itself started the investigation by a resolution directing the Federal Trade Commission to inquire into the price of this paper, and to make such recommendations as they saw fit.

Mr. HARDING. Yes; that is all quite true. This new arrangement—and I should like to have this very select company know about this—

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, would it disturb the Senator if he yielded to me for the purpose of getting him a larger company?

Mr. HARDING. No; I would not wish that.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator would not wish it?

Mr. HARDING. No; I am very particular. I rather relish the thought that at a time like this, when the American Republic is headed straight for a condition of State socialism, when we are seemingly doing everything in the world possible to paralyze individual initiative, when we are taking the Government of this Republic from the hands of the people and putting the people in the hands of the Government, when we are "hellbent" to the very condition that led Germany to bring on the war to save her from herself, and we have before us a measure so vital as this, relating to Government control of private industry, the Senate is so employed that there are six or seven of us present to discuss this great, vital problem!

Mr. President, I am not taking this extreme paucity of attention as a personal defect of mine, because it is characteristic of all the discussion that has been going on upon the floor of the Senate pertaining to these tremendously important questions; and I can hope for no great satisfaction, except that in the end I shall have put my warning into the records of this body, and the Nation that ultimately comes to repentance can read.

However, getting back to the problem in its practical phase, the Federal Trade Commission made an arrangement with the news-print producers of this country that beginning January 1, 1918, they would supply paper in rolls, carload lots, at the mill, at the basic price of 3 cents per pound, for a period of three months. I may say that that will save the average medium-sized publisher, if continued throughout the year, a sufficient cost on his paper product to pay a dividend on his capital. The arrangement further provided that after an experimental period of three months' control by the Trade Commission, a readjustment of price should be made after an ascertainment by the commission of the cost of production. Nobody disputes the arrangement. Nobody has proposed to abandon that arrangement; but the Senator from Arizona says he thinks he sees signs of trying to get away from it. I can tell you what the signs are; but, mark you, I hold no brief for the paper manufacturers. The signs are that the print-paper producers are gathering their forces to show what the cost of production is, and the newspaper men have been foolish enough to express the apprehension that the print manufacturers are going to produce a larger cost figure than anyone has been willing previously to believe. I want to say in this connection that if the Federal Trade Commission is so utterly incompetent, so utterly unworthy to pass upon a presentation of cost figures, then I do not want such an incompetent body to have control of the distribution of the print supply of this country.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me right there?

Mr. HARDING. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. There will be no need of a Federal Trade Commission or anybody else to settle what the cost of print paper is if you will permit the same processes and the same morality to carry on the business of fixing what the cost is. There is no necessity for this investigation if you are limited to what they say, and if they combine now, as they did before, when they advertised to the world that they were going to raise the cost of paper, and notified each one of the manufacturers to make an extravagant return of costs so that they would be justified in increasing the price.

To answer further along the line of what the Senator has suggested as to this agreement, the agreement did fix the price of paper in rolls, carload lots, at the mill, at the price quoted.

Mr. HARDING. If the Senator wants to make an answer to my statement, I much prefer that he shall do so later.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I am not doing that. I am suggesting that the Senator did not do me justice in saying that I was

contending against that and had nothing but a fear of a combination. That did not apply to the cut paper. It did not apply to any particle of paper except that in carload lots at the mill. If this joint resolution had nothing else to do except to attend to that, the Senator would not find me here advocating it.

Mr. HARDING. The Senator is mistaken. The agreement does apply to cut paper, but it does not provide for the same price for it, and here is the reason for that: I happen to have, in my capacity as a news-print buyer, a copy of the agreement made by the Federal Trade Commission with the manufacturers of this country, and I know what it contains. It does provide for a higher price for the cut paper, because there is more expense involved in preparing that paper for the market. The roll buyer gets his paper from the machine, turned out in the roll, and the moment it is wrapped it is ready for the car, for shipment. The buyer of cut paper must have that paper put through the process of cutting, packing, and counting into reams, which is a very different proposition; and the price is all accurately adjusted in this contract between the commission and the producer. I happen to have two contracts in my possession, though they are not before me just at this moment, which fix the agreement between the manufacturers and the Federal Trade Commission as the basis of our trade; and now I am going to utter my selfish reason for opposing this measure.

I do not want the United States Government to come in and again upset a friendly arrangement, with the result of increasing the cost of news-print paper to the consumers of this country. That is precisely what the prosecution did last year, though I am not attempting to criticize that action. The prosecution that was undertaken last year cost the newspaper publishers of this country not less than \$5,000,000.

The Senator from Arizona misses one of the very essential points in this discussion. One news-print mill can produce paper at a cent a pound. I understand that there is one that produces it at a little less than a cent a pound. Another will produce it at a cent and a half a pound, and there may be scores of them that can not produce news print nowadays at less than 3 cents a pound. That is easy to explain. One large concern owns its own spruce forests, and it has an abundant supply of the raw material which it turns into sulphite pulp itself. It probably does it where it has an abundance of water power and cheap production. Another mill may be more or less antiquated. It may be four, five, or six hundred miles from the spruce forests. It may have no water power except during certain portions of the year, and in order to carry out its contracts for delivery it must grind and roll paper at certain seasons of the year with steam power.

You do not want any arrangement in this country, when there is a shortage of supply, that will cut out even the antiquated producer. That is where the Government made a very serious mistake in trying to control the fuel situation of the country. I voted for it, and I am glad we attempted to control the fuel situation, because that concerned the great masses of our people, and dealt in a large part with the distress of the people and the paralysis of necessary activities in this country. But the news-print situation does not involve such a question as that; and when the price of coal was fixed in this country the Fuel Administrator took no cognizance of the scalper, of the little producer who had gone in and added his thousands of tons of coal to the supply of this country, because prices were so high that he could profit through his crude processes. The price fixing shut him off, and immediately our supply was diminished by that much, when we ought really, for the country's good, to have had a variation in prices that would have permitted the little producer to continue his activities.

As a consumer of news-print paper anxious to see a sufficient supply to adjust the market in this country, I do not want a price that is going to shut down the mill that is producing by old-time methods. I do not want to shut down the mill that must buy its pulp from the pulp producer or its sulphite from the sulphite producer or must turn to steam power when its water supply fails. The only real way to adjust a price in the United States of America in time of peace or in time of war is to encourage a supply equal to the demand; and the trouble with this country is that we are trying to do these things by the artificial process of Government control, and it will prove the most miserable failure that was ever attempted by any civilized people.

I have said these things so far, Mr. President and the faithful, from the selfish viewpoint of the newspaper publisher. Now, let us for a moment ask ourselves where we are drifting.

Mr. President, I have voted for a good many measures in the last five months that were repugnant to my conception of governmental ideals. I have accepted the program of the admin-

istration almost without question, because I love my country far more than any political party; and I have assumed that the Executive, with complete knowledge of the situation, with facts I do not possess, knew infinitely better than I could hope to know what was required. I have been following along patriotically and blindly, accepting the call for legislation that has been proposed in the name of a war emergency. But I am resisting the passage of this measure because there is not a stretch of the imagination anywhere that will make this one a war-emergency measure.

The news-print situation is serious, to be sure, but a shortage would not seriously interfere with the Government's conduct of the war, because the most embarrassed agency in furthering the success of the Government in the war just now is the press of this country. It is true that we have not paralyzed it. The press, in the main, is loyal and wants to be helpful, but if you are going to conserve expenditure, if you are going to apply the Government-control policy, why not abandon the news associations that are spending their millions? Why not abolish the scores of special correspondents who are here at the expense of their publishers? Why not eliminate competition between newspapers in any given city and have one Government agency of publicity under the direction of Mr. Creel, of the department of publicity, and just tell the American people what the Government thinks it ought to know? Seriously, I tell you, we are on the verge now of being a people subject to the Government.

Mr. President, if you want to know the drift, there may be one illuminating fact. It is estimated that in the last 15 years the Government forces in Washington have increased by far more than 100 per cent. Suppose the population of the United States increased 1 per cent a year—you can make it larger if you like—then the population of this country will be increased 15 per cent in 15 years. So we are adding to the Federal forces engaged in Government work more than six times the addition to the population of the country. That applies only to the Federal Government, and we have only fairly begun in the establishment of bureaucracy in this land. Now, go a little further. We have followed the same inclination to put the people in the hands of the Government, rather than the Government in the hands of the people, except when we made a very miserable attempt at reformation, to which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] referred the other day, in our primary system, to which is to be added the privilege of suffrage soon to come. In the States we have more than doubled the Government bureaus and Government agents controlling private affairs, and it does not end in the States. You can follow it to the municipality. In my State, where we have a basic limitation to the municipal tax rate, every great municipality in that State is facing a deficit in its financial affairs, and you can not raise money enough under the limitations to pay the expenses of municipal government. Where are we drifting?

Mr. SHERMAN. Will the Senator allow me to state, in order to fortify his statement, that the same condition prevails in the municipalities of Illinois. Nearly all the taxes are levied under delegated powers and limitations of the constitution and the statutes of the State.

Mr. HARDING. I have no doubt that that is the case. It is the tendency throughout the country.

I am not sure, Mr. President, where I want to place the blame. When the German Kaiser decided to make war for the world's domination he cast a solvent into our present-day civilization that has put us in a very fluid state, and I am frank to say to the Members of the Senate who honor me with their hearing that I am a lot more concerned about the aftermath of the war than I am of the winning of it. Senators, if you go on adding to governmental control, and that is all this joint resolution is whatever else may be said about it, I want to hear from the genius who can offer a way to get back to normal conditions. I do not think we ever will. I think the sociological conditions of the past under which this American Republic was made, what we boast it to be, will never be re-established. I am a good deal like the optimist who testified yesterday before the Senate Committee on Commerce. I am willing to take my chances in accordance with whatever conditions there are, with the sanction of the Government. But while I am willing to take my chances, and while I recognize the utter hopelessness of restoring the conditions of individualism under which we achieved as we have, nevertheless I think I should be remiss in my conscientious service as a public official if I did not cry out against a tendency which will ultimately put the bolsheviki in control of the United States.

Senators, I must allude to the Government assuming control of transportation, which would never have been necessary for a moment if we had allowed the railway managers of this

country to do what the Government will now do on its own account. May I digress for a moment? There is nothing very pressing.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Nothing that I know of.

Mr. HARDING. In all, we have been very unthinking, and so unreasonable, so demagogic, if I may use the word, in dealing with the railroad problem. Out in my State, when I was a member of the general assembly, I remember voting for a statute forbidding State lines paralleling, and in natural competition from ever entering into any combination or amalgamation. When we found ourselves out in Ohio distressed by the fuel situation, as every section of the country did, the railroad managers of two parallel lines from the coal fields to the Lakes, both single-track roads, seeing the difficulty of handling the congested traffic over single-track lines, and at one time having had sufficiently intimate and friendly relations to have contemplated a merger, suggested that they would take from the coal fields to the Lakes the loaded trains over one line, keeping them constantly moving in one direction, and they would take the empty trains of cars back to the mines over the other line, keeping them moving in one direction, and thereby adding notably to the efficiency of the service.

But what happened? Our old statute in Ohio forbidding pooling or joint operation or any friendly cooperation was called to the attention of the courts and that helpful contribution to efficiency in an emergency was halted by the courts of the State of Ohio.

Of course, under Government control you eliminate those things. It is a pity that we could not have eliminated them long ago. Now we shall have Government control, probably, founded on the investigation and conclusions of some of the most eminent railroad talent in the United States, after six or eight months of careful, studious work in trying to solve this difficult situation, and if it proves a success, then the achievement wrought through the suspension of the laws of this country will be used as an argument for Government control of the railway system of the land.

If you are going to control the railroads, and if you are going to control the fuel supply and the food supply in this country, it is not at all abnormal to reach out and take control of the paper supply. The next logical step, if the advertisers or the subscribers of this country have a grievance about prices, is for Government control of the press, and we have more or less of that already, without the financial obligations that go with public business.

Where are we drifting? I listened the other day to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] with very deep interest in his tribute to the individualism which brought about the development of this country. I want to supplement what he said and go on record as saying now that notwithstanding many of the plausible theories of the socialistic doctrines which are being applied in this country just now, and some of them may be helpful—and, so far as the promotion of brotherhood is concerned, I cordially agree—I make the prediction that the socialistic tendency of this country to-day will prove to be the Nation's paralysis. It will stop every development. It will hinder every initiative essential to the progress of the people in the making of a great nation.

I hope, Senators, while we find ourselves brought to the test on a little measure relating to news-print control in this country when there is not any essential call for it, there will be enough Members of this body to assert their convictions and say, "No; we are not going to do these things that are not necessary to the winning of the war."

If it were necessary to paralyze America to save us from Germany I would vote for that paralysis. I remember some of my colleagues in this body criticized me rather severely some months ago when I ventured to say in a rather informal way that I believed a dictator was necessary to the winning of the war. Whether I was wise in saying it or not, you now have the dictator, and I think we are going to win the war. We must; we will. But listen, Senators. Let us not hamper ourselves for the trial to come in the recovery after the war. Let us not put the manufacture of paper, let us not put the manufacture of wearing apparel, let us not put the manufacture of the thousand and one things that are not directly related to the war in the hands of Government control in order to increase the tremendous population which has turned Washington from a normal, easy-going Capital into an over-crowded mining camp, where we have not only the adventurers and those who sell for war but the profiteers who are seeking fat places in Government service.

Mr. President, I had not expected to talk to this hour on this subject. I do not know that I have said to the Members of the Senate the things that I wanted to convey to them. But busi-

ness is one thing and politics is another, and I am convinced that they do not always satisfactorily mix. I do not want to find myself supplicating a Washington bureau for a supply of news print with which to issue the publication for which I am the sponsor. I do not want to put into the hands of the President of the United States, even though he be as the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] said yesterday, "the most popular and worshipped man in the world to-day," the power to say, "No; Harding's Marion Star does not get any newspaper supply until everybody else is cared for." I do not want to make it possible for the President of the United States or any agency of the President of the United States to punish in its news supply any newspaper in this land. Let us be content with what the Postmaster General can do to us. You have not thought of all these things; there are too many others that have been given consideration.

So, Senators, I admonish you who have honored me with your hearing, let us call it to the attention of others in this body who are unable to be here, either because of their engagements or who are unwilling to be here; and let us ask them to halt this tendency until the necessity is proven for such radical action.

I submit that the Senator from Arizona has not made a very strong case, because the newspapers of this country are going to be more injured than helped by the passage of this joint resolution. You can never bring paper down to anything like the normal price until you have encouraged a sufficient production in this country, or encourage a production for import, to meet the demand. I warn you now, you will never increase the production under Government regulation and control. If you want to put the Government into the manufacture, then you are only adding one more nail into the great casket in which you are going to bury the Republic that we boast of and put in its place a socialistic order that will be the land of paralysis and hopelessness for all time to come.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I am not surprised at all at the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING], but I am somewhat surprised at the mistaken historical facts which he brings out in reference to the price of print paper. He gives as an illustration the great increase of print-paper cost at the time of the Spanish-American War. I have before me a compilation made by Mr. Tuttle, former treasurer of the New York Tribune, for the period of many years, and then of the International Paper Co., who gives the following as the price of paper during the years named.

Beginning with 1860, it was 8 cents a pound. During the Civil War it reached 22 cents, and it was not before 1874 that it got below 12 cents. In 1889 it was 3 cents, and in 1896 it had reached 2.25 cents, and in 1897, 1898, 1899, 1900, and 1901, clear through all the reconstructive industries, if you please, if any had ever been dislocated during the Spanish-American War, in those years afterwards this same paper we are talking about to-day sold for 1.8 cents a pound. That answers the congested condition that the Senator spoke of in the present war time. Now, taking the present war, in 1913 all this paper sold at 2.25 cents. So in 1910, 1911, 1912, 1913. In 1914 the paper sold at 2.15 cents, in 1915 at 2.15 cents, in 1916 at 2.15 cents. That is where the combination of which I have spoken began and where the Senate, after its operations, passed a resolution giving to the Trade Commission the power to investigate and make a report to Congress. Through the investigation of that commission the facts were found as I have set forth in the report on this joint resolution, and a good deal more will be found if the Senator will refer to the report of the commission that I had not the time nor the inclination to print in full in the report on the pending joint resolution. So the Senator's statement is not true. They are selling independent paper in New York at 2.5 cents, and never asked any more.

Yet it is a very easy matter for the gentlemen running a great business to manipulate it in this way. As I said before, it is not in any sense immoral. It is the result of the tendency of human trade. If I have advantages, I want to keep them as long as I can keep outside of any indication or suspicion of any moral turpitude about it. So the men feel who have the right and essential advantage in the distribution of this paper and in the purchase of it. I ask my friend what cares he for the price of paper? If the price is going high, he can absolutely kill all competition. If it is 10 cents a pound, they will quit the business.

The resolution looks to controlling the price of paper and keeping it at a fair price, and a fair price is to be found by the Trade Commission. Every item of cost that the Senator spoke of will be justly and fairly estimated by any sensible board in ascertaining the cost of production. If they find that

the men who are manufacturing it can not make any profit under 4 cents I have, not any doubt, neither has any man here a doubt they would recommend a profit sufficient to pay all that these men ought to receive in time of war and furnish what I consider and what any thoughtful man who will give his attention to it must consider an extremely vital element, if you please, in the conduct of the war itself.

I am paying the newspapers no particular tribute, but with few exceptions these newspapers, whatever their politics, have stood behind this Government in the awful struggle through which it is now marching. Without their aid what would you have done with your liberty loans? What would you have done when you made an appeal for a conscription law, if you please? What would you have done in every great effort that is so essential to ending the war successfully if it had not been for the universal support that the press of the country gave to the great measures which we were considering?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNARY in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator what would have become of the newspapers of the country if they had opposed the liberty loan or the conscription law. What would have happened to them?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I do not know.

Mr. GALLINGER. I know.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I do not know what might have happened to them. A good many of them did it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Their subscribers would have repudiated them.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. A good many that did it are still running.

Mr. GALLINGER. Not many of them who opposed the liberty loan? I do not know of any.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I notice that none of them suffered very materially afterwards. But I should like to know what would become of them if you are going to charge them under a combination 8 cents a pound.

Mr. GALLINGER. Nobody proposes that.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. If in this trouble they are entitled to any sort of consideration nobody should trespass on their rights. These men have made a profit of 29 per cent after deducting taxes and everything else. Do you tell me that they themselves are not ready to submit to a profit say of 10 per cent, or whatever is necessary, that the paper may be sold to those needing it, and to the United States Government as well as any other applicant for it at a fair and reasonable price?

I am not going to stand here and debate now what is going to happen after the war, the seizure of railroads, and all that. I only protest against that argument being used and arousing all the prejudices that can be excited for the purpose of hurting this particular measure. It is an ingenious way of argument to say that something is going to happen, and here is a bill going along the same line, less hurtful, it is true, but if we pass it the newspapers can never be printed again without governmental supervision.

Mr. WATSON. May I ask the Senator is it not true that on two occasions press censorship was sought here and voted down by a majority, and is not this the rankest form of press censorship that it is possible to be set up in the United States?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Emphatically and absolutely there is not one vestige of fact in the suggestion. You can not find an editorial to that effect in any paper in the country. I have three or four thousand editorials on the very question of censorship. There is no protest from a single one of them on that ground. Read the report of the committee on the joint resolution and you will see how much the newspapers fear censorship.

Mr. STONE. I should like to inquire in what way the joint resolution, if enacted into a statute, could be made or would be made an instrumentality of censoring the newspapers of the country?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I do not know, unless they want to claim that inasmuch as you have the power of distribution the parties having the power would say, "We do not like the color of your hair or the cut of your jib, or something you have said in the newspapers, and therefore we, the great commission for the sole purpose of being absolutely fair in the world, will say that newspaper shall stop." That is not the commission suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire. If it attempted anything like that, the vote has already been shown in this body, and not only that, but from the inspiration that warms the hearts of every one of us we know that the commission itself would not stand for five minutes in the respect of the world if

it attempted to do these little prejudicial damages to people who did not happen to speak according to their particular wishes. It is ridiculous to talk about it and to belittle this question to such a degree as that.

Mr. STONE obtained the floor.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, in connection with the remarks I made before the Senator from Missouri took the floor I ask unanimous consent to have printed, rather than to read it, an editorial on the question of the control of print paper coming from the Editor and Publisher, of New York, on January 5. It is very largely an expression of the views which I entertain. I have indicated by marks on the paper what I should like to have appear in the RECORD at the end of my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. GALLINGER. What is the request, Mr. President?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. My request is, because my throat is in bad condition, that instead of reading it there may be printed in the RECORD an editorial on the very questions which we are now discussing.

Mr. GALLINGER. From what paper?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. From the New York Editor and Publisher, a paper about 45 or 50 years old, I think.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, while I am, as a rule, opposed to loading down the RECORD with newspaper editorials and articles of various kinds, which practice we have carried to an alarming extent, I can not object to this editorial going into the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The Senator from New Hampshire knows full well that he and I equally agree as to that, and I commend his course in regard to it; but I have never heard the question raised, when a Senator on the floor has asked that a particular matter be incorporated in his remarks, as to permitting it to be done.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have no objection, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection, and the editorial will be printed, as requested.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

[From the Editor and Publisher, Jan. 5, 1918.]

FEDERAL CONTROL.

We have Government control of the railroads, and the skies have not fallen nor has the social fabric been shattered. In a commonwealth—of which a republic is the best example—sovereignty is vested in the people and delegated by them to chosen executives. In normal times the exercise of authority over the people in whom it is primarily vested and from whose collective will it must proceed, is attended, happily, with as little interference with individual freedom as is compatible with the communal interest.

In war times, when the national purpose is unified and the national needs paramount, individual interests are subject to the merciless test of "the common good."

The immediate task of the Nation, to which all individual interests must contribute, is the winning of the war. That the railroads may become an effective part of the fighting machinery of the Nation, their direction has been placed in the hands of one man. That the commodities essential to the life of the people and for the conduct of the war may have preference in shipment, priority orders are formulated. The necessities are given right of way.

Some timorous people profess to see great danger in the present internal policies of the Government—in the adoption of Federal control of the vital business interests of the country. Jealous of any menace to individual rights, these people see in this drastic action an attack upon the sacred citadel. It is a mistaken alarm. The ship of state is steaming steadily and stoutly in stormy seas, and its navigating officers seek first to conserve the safety of the ship, and must not permit that purpose to be disregarded in order to cater to the comfort whims of the passengers.

In view of the larger adoption of the policy of Federal control, the opponents of such control of the news-print industry sound a feeble and unconvincing note of protest. As a matter of fact and as a conclusion based upon common sense, Federal control of the news-print industry is now necessary—necessary alike to the sellers and to the users of that commodity.

With control vested in the Federal Trade Commission, as the pending Smith resolution provides, the publishers of the country will have at Washington a governmental agency committed to the task of supervising the distribution of news print. The publisher whose supply may be held up through freight congestion would then be able, through the intervention of the Trade Commission, to have his shipment hurried to him in ample time to meet his urgent needs. Under present conditions, with the railroads committed to priority orders in freight handling—some of these orders perhaps not of the wisest—the publisher whose carload of paper is sidetracked somewhere has small chance of speeding up its journey. The Trade Commission, armed with authority, could quickly unravel these shipping tangles. Convinced, as the commissioners are, that the publication of newspapers is a war need of the primal sort, they would see to it that no newspaper should face suspension through a lack of news print.

The distribution of news print under war conditions can not be managed properly under any plan short of Federal control. That the Congress should hesitate to establish such control is due, in large part, to the lethargy of publishers in the matter. If every user of news print should see to it that his Representative at Washington is fully informed of the conditions existing and of the urgent need of Government control, the Smith resolution would meet with little opposition.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, under the present law the Postmaster General is clothed with sufficient power to shut news-

papers out of the mail when they do not speak in accordance with the judgment of departmental officials. Now, there is a censorship, but here is a bill which proposes merely to prevent undue extortion by a certain class of producers upon a certain class of consumers. To say that if that power is granted the governmental agencies would undertake to control distribution or to direct distribution in a way to inflict punishment, so to speak, upon a given newspaper or upon a number of newspapers seems impossible.

Mr. WATSON. May I interrupt the Senator? Does he agree that if the Federal Trade Commission sought to use the power in that way that under the terms and provisions of this joint resolution they have the power and that they could do it?

Mr. STONE. I doubt it. I do not think so. I do not think that the Federal Trade Commission would be given the power under the terms of the joint resolution to deny to me, one publisher, the right to have my supplies in a wholly different and to me a hurtful way from that in which like supplies would be furnished to the Senator from Indiana, if he were conducting a publication similar to mine. That would be such a gross abuse of power that I think the courts could be appealed to to remedy it, and I do not believe it would ever be attempted.

Mr. SMOOT. However, the joint resolution authorizes it.

Mr. STONE. If the joint resolution authorizes any such thing as that, which I do not believe—

Mr. SMOOT. That is what it does.

Mr. STONE. The Senator from Utah so construes it, I assume; but I do not. If, however, it does, by a line or a change of word or two, any such power as that, if it is sought to confer it, could be withdrawn from the provisions of the joint resolution. There is no need of being hypercritical about this joint resolution. If such power as that indicated by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Watson] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] is written in the language of the joint resolution, it can be easily rectified; but, Mr. President, I do not think we ought to be hunting mere excuses here and there to throttle this measure. Let us settle it upon its broad merits.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I do not care to discuss this proposition at any considerable length. I have made plain to the Senate the ground of my opposition to it. It is putting the Government into a private business wholly unrelated to and entirely disconnected with the real prosecution of this war. There is no reason for it, from the standpoint of giving relief to the newspaper publishers, because it has not been many months since the Post Office Department submitted proof to the Senate showing that every penny of the increased expense to which these publications have been put as to print paper, in most cases at least, has been passed on to the public, usually through the advertising rates.

It is inconceivable to my mind that the ordinary criminal laws and the great volume of trust laws that we have are not efficient to relieve the situation, if there is a combination in restraint of trade or operating in violation of law. Unless we are prepared to admit that our system of trust regulation and suppression, and of criminal prosecution for violations of the laws against restraint of trade or combinations in restraint of trade, have utterly failed, there is no justification whatever for this measure.

It seems to me, Mr. President, as if day by day, and in one transaction after another, in many important particulars we are absolutely departing from the great structural principles on which this Government rests. We have built up a centralized Federal power in this Government, and in matters wholly unrelated to the prosecution of this war, that would have amazed Alexander Hamilton, and that exceed the wildest dream that he ever dreamed; and Democrats still professing the Democratic faith have done it. We have surrendered in many important and essential features the principle, not only fundamentally Democratic, but fundamentally American, of local self-government. We did it when we passed the child-labor law, undertaking to regulate the hours and terms and conditions on which labor may be employed in every State of the Union; we did it when we abandoned the ancient, historic, democratic, yea, American, position on the liquor question, and said that the Government of the United States, acting nationally, should control that question, instead of each locality asserting its own will with respect to it.

It is proposed now to do it, not only with respect to such little measures as the one proposed by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Smith], but with respect to the suffrage question. The right of each State to fix and determine for itself the qualifications of its electors is one of the fundamental propositions that underlie and support local self-government, if not the one most fundamental of them all.

In that connection, I want to read the thoughtful words of the greatest Democratic newspapers in the North. I agree with

them in part, at least. I believe, however, that the application of the memorial address printed this morning in the New York World is broader than a mere party application. The dirge that ought to be sung is not only the death of Democratic ideals and Democratic principles, but of American ideals and American principles. The editorial is entitled "In memoriam," and it reads as follows:

The World's famous question, "Shall the Democratic Party die?" has been answered. The historical Democratic Party is dead.

We do not mean that the Democratic organization has ceased to exist. We do not mean that there are no more Democrats. Nor do we mean that the Democratic Party is dead in the sense that the Federalist Party is dead, or the Whig Party is dead, or the Greenback Party is dead, or the Populist Party is dead. What has died is the Democratic Party of Jefferson and Jackson and Tilden. The principles of government which they enunciated and advocated have been obliterated. What slavery and secession and silver were unable to accomplish has been brought about by prohibition and woman suffrage. The deathblow to Jeffersonian Democracy was delivered by the Democratic Senators and Representatives from the South and West under the leadership of William J. Bryan, who carried through the prohibition amendment. The coup de grace was administered by Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, in indorsing the Federal suffrage amendment to the Constitution.

The kind of government for which the Jeffersonian Democracy successfully battled for more than a century has been repudiated. Centralization is now invited, not repelled. State rights have been assassinated in the ancient citadel of State rights. The charter of local self-government has become a scrap of paper. The way is now open for the obliteration of the States in all their essential functions and the erection of a central government more powerful than anything of which Alexander Hamilton dared to dream.

To-day there are no fundamental differences of principle between Democrats and Republicans. The two parties are interchangeable so far as any vital profession of faith is concerned. Republicans claim to be better business men than Democrats, and hence quicker and slicker in grabbing a dollar; Democrats claim to be more honest and simple-minded than Republicans. Republicans bitterly resent the fact that the Democrats are in possession of the disgusting ambition of the Democrats to get back into power. It is not of such stuff that great parties are formed or great issues vitalized.

Perhaps it was all inevitable. Perhaps it was ordained that a time would come when an impatient people would deliberately throw away as too cumbersome the old system of checks and balances that the fathers provided in framing the Constitution and give over the minority to the tyranny of the majority until a new system could be created in the light of better experience. It is difficult to quarrel with events, however much we may regret them, but dangerous to ignore them.

A great revolution has suddenly come about in the Government of the United States. Strangely enough, it has come about during the Presidency of one of the greatest Democrats in all history—

So says the New York World—

whose leadership is hardly less commanding in Europe than at home—a leadership which in many respects holds out hope of democracy in civilization. Yet under that leadership the institutions of the United States have been permanently changed without a word of protest from him in one instance and with his active assistance in the other. The clock can not be turned back. Yet we may wonder if the President is so keenly absorbed in the processes of anarchy in Russia as to be oblivious to what is happening to our own institutions.

It is possible that out of the stress and circumstance of this world war will come a new Democratic Party in the United States—a Wilsonian democracy in place of a Jeffersonian democracy. But can it find means of restoring the balance and provide new methods for insuring that organized self-control without which all free government is bound to sink to the present level of Russia or is forced to establish an elective autocracy as a means of self-preservation? We shall see what we shall see.

Of the two instruments by which the old Jeffersonian democracy succeeded in committing suicide the most dangerous weapon, of course, is prohibition. Suffrage by Federal amendment, in spite of its perversion of the original theory of American institutions, is at least an extension of human freedom. It is not, like prohibition, an absolute suffocation of individual rights and personal liberties at the mandate of three-fourths of the legislatures. The suffrage amendment may result in as many complications and misfortunes as the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments produced, but we can say of it that ipso facto it invades no man's home, nor does it prescribe what he may eat or what he may drink or how he shall order his life.

At the same time the two amendments taken together, the one championed by southern Democrats still giving a lip service to the old party faith, and the other indorsed by the President who deliberately abandoned an issue on which he was reelected in 1916, are as completely at variance with all the fundamental purposes of the old democracy as those purposes were at variance with federalism.

The World has never been able to regard change and progress as synonymous, and it can not do so in this instance. Nor can we believe that the advantages of the political expediency which have dictated official Democratic policy in regard to these issues are adequate compensation for the utter sacrifice of principles which had given to the Democratic Party the longest continuous history of any political party in the world.

Possibly we are too apprehensive about the future, but a change of so radical a character may well be considered apprehensively. Each generation must work out its own salvation, and it is not wholly beyond the nature of things that out of the ashes of the old Democratic Party will spring a new democracy more vigorous and more insistent than ever upon these elementary rights without the continuous assertion of which free institutions have never succeeded in maintaining themselves. That remains to be seen.

The World is no prophet of disaster. In paying a respectful tribute to the dead it implies no reproach to the living. But the record is the record.

So speaks the greatest Democratic newspaper of the Nation this morning in its leading editorial. If it be not considered treason in these momentous and stirring times to express my agreement, I want to say that, in part at least, I agree with

this editorial. The ancient party of my faith, the party of Jefferson, of Jackson, of Tilden, and of Cleveland, is no more. If there is a Democrat alive to-day in the Senate or out of it or anywhere in this Republic who can show me a single principle to which it has proven its fidelity, I would like to have him stand up and name it.

I do not think our Republican friends are in much, if any better, position; but I know that the Democratic faith that I learned at my mother's knee and that I have cherished all my life is not respected or followed here. Local self-government! Is it the corner stone of the Democratic faith? If so, wherein have you kept the covenant? A low tariff, for revenue only! I can demonstrate to any audience, in this body or out of it, that in many instances we have proven false to that profession of faith. Opposition to federalism, to strong centralized power! When did we cease to believe in it? We certainly have long since ceased to practice such opposition.

Mr. President, I must confess that at times I almost despair of the Republic when I see one autocratic power piled upon the top of another unnecessarily and without a word of protest or of challenge. I realize that when we are engaged in a war the Executive ought to be given every power that is necessary for its adequate prosecution, and no man would be quicker to bestow that power than would I; but this movement did not begin with this war; it is not related to this war; it is totally disconnected with this war. When it is all over and the war is won, I hope the people of America will get back some few of their liberties; but, so far as I am concerned, unless some one can show to me the absolute and direct connection of measures of this sort with the war itself and with its actual and direct prosecution, I am disposed to keep a few of my liberties instead of surrendering them all. I know we will have those that we do not surrender, but I am not certain whether we will get back those that we do surrender and, if we ever do get them back, when we will get them back.

This is no war measure in any sense, in any shape, form, or fashion. If you want to pass it because you are willing to concede that Jefferson's old idea that the least governed people are the best governed people, that the idea under which we have all operated, the idea that individual initiative and individual enterprise could run the private business and the private industry of this country, regulated by law and controlled by law, and when they violate the laws against combinations and trusts prosecuted and punished by law—I say, if you want to concede that all that has failed and you want to set up a socialistic government, strongly centralized, with its powers here in Washington increased until the powers of the present Executive exceed those ever conferred upon or ever wielded by even the most despotic and autocratic of the Caesars, and in matters wholly unrelated to and entirely disconnected with this war, then, of course, we will know what we are facing and what we are about to embrace.

Mr. President, I know not what course other Senators may adopt—I care, of course, very vitally—but so far as I am concerned, I wish to put the Senate and the country on notice here and now, on this measure and on all others, that I propose, so far as I can, to see that this Government remains a Government of coordinated powers; I propose to do all in my power to prevent the building up of despotic and democratic and unnecessary power and authority in the hands of any one man, be he termed President or what not.

The Constitution itself confers on the Chief Executive ample power, plenary power, for the prosecution of the war, and I have no objection to giving him all the power that any Executive ought to have for the prosecution of the war, but, Senators, I warn you, do not on that account and for that reason, because we are in this war, let pass every sort of measure that may come in here labeled a war measure seeking to give to the Executive this power and that power and the other power during the war, in that way building up an executive authority the like of which was never seen in a free country—an executive authority so great that if we do not finally check this movement the country can not long remain free.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if there were any prospect of an immediate vote upon this measure, I should not detain the Senate by discussing it. From intimations which have been expressed, however, I infer that a vote to-day will be practically out of the question, and consequently I do not feel that I am trespassing upon the time of the Senate in suggesting some reasons which will impel me to support the resolution.

In 1916 we created what is known as the Federal Trade Commission, and armed it with certain powers and responsibilities, by a bill which was the subject of very extensive and elaborate discussion in both Houses. I was unable to lend it the sanction of my approval, because I could not perceive how the commis-

sion under its provisions would be able to rectify the abuses at which it was aimed. I felt that it should go much further or that we should not assume to legislate upon the subject at all.

I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet, yet I think it is fair to assert that the operations of the commission since the enactment of the law have not been entirely satisfactory or successful. That may be due to the personnel of the commission quite as much as to the powers which the bill conferred upon them. As to that, I make no comment; I do not know. From the report of the committee upon this joint resolution, however, and assuming its correctness, it appears that the commission's efforts to control the evil at which this joint resolution is aimed have been unsuccessful. Upon page 6 of that report appears an extract from the report of the commission regarding the news-print situation, which recites that—

The efforts of the commission to restore competitive conditions in the news-print industry expeditiously and to arbitrate and effectively project a fair price for news-print paper have failed.

That is a confession either that the commission is not equal to the duty which has been imposed upon it, or that the law imposing that duty is so defective as to make the object sought to be attained beyond the power of the commission. But, however that may be, the commission is upon record that as to this particular difficulty its efforts to remove it have failed. The report recites, in some degree, what those efforts have been, for one of the conclusions reached between the commission and the combination was the fixing of a certain maximum price for its product, shortly after which some members of the combination withdrew from the arbitration, and as a consequence the arrangement proposed was ineffective.

Now, what are the conditions confronting the country and which provoke this joint resolution? Briefly stated, they are that a certain number of manufacturers of a very important and highly essential commodity have formed a combination, including manufacturers whose output embraces practically 80 per cent of the product, whose purpose it is to dominate that particular business, and to make successful competition impossible. The outline of the agreement is set forth on page 7 of the report, and that I assume to have been the basis of the indictment afterwards presented against a very considerable number of those executing it which indictment has been followed by what the lawyers call a *nolo contendere*, which does not involve an admission of guilt upon the one hand, but requires the infliction of a penalty upon the other.

This agreement is "to refrain from competing with each other in the matter of securing new customers for their paper; to refrain from competing with each other as to the quality of the paper to be sold; to refrain from competing with each other as to the delivery of and furnishing storage for paper sold but not delivered; to refrain from competing with each other as to the terms of credit, rate of interest on open accounts, dates of beginning and ending of contracts, the methods of making sales of paper through salesmen, dealers, and jobbers, the payment of return freight on the cores upon which their paper is wrapped, the payment of charges for cartage, and allowance of claims for waste or damaged paper; to engage in simultaneous representations to the public, to their customers, and to each other of the alleged increased cost of manufacture and of the alleged shortage of news-print paper, and to manufacture insufficient quantities of such paper with the object of concertedly working for materially higher prices; to cooperate in discouraging the erection of new mills or the installation of new machines for the manufacture of news print; to cooperate in preventing new concerns from competing with them by transferring orders and contracts for paper to new concerns on condition that such new companies should not compete with them; to furnish from time to time to the News Print Manufacturers' Association at No. 18 East Forty-first Street, New York City, for the information of the defendants, full and complete information concerning contracts with their customers and the quantity of the paper manufactured, carried in stock, or sold by them; also, the capacity of their various plans, and other details of their business."

It appears, in addition to this agreement, or as a part of it, that the country was partitioned out between and among these manufacturers, each having his own set of customers with whom the others would in no wise interfere, in that way still further strengthening the monopoly inevitably resulting from these drastic covenants.

Mr. President, I am unable to imagine anything which could be added to this agreement which would make it a more complete, searching, and far-reaching combination in restraint of trade than appears from the language cited. It was evidently made with much deliberation, and with the full and complete knowledge of all of the conditions connected with the print-

paper trade. Unless all human experience is at fault, the purpose of the combination was to enhance the price of the product to the consumer by compelling him to purchase from one customer, and from one customer only, because under such an agreement competition was out of the question:

It may be, Mr. President, that the day of competition is over. It may be that those who contend that competition is wasteful, and productive of anything but benefit as an ultimate result, are correct. But in view of the fact that Congress has not so determined, but, upon the contrary, has enacted legislation penalizing such combinations in the interest of fair competition, the question for this purpose is foreclosed. The law has been written, and it must and ought to speak for itself; and that law has placed the ban not only of disapproval but of criminality upon such a combination as this, and upon all similar combinations against which the Federal Trade Commission is confessedly powerless, and regarding which indictments are lightly set aside upon pleas of *nolo contendere*, followed by fines so infinitely out of all proportion to the enormous amount of profit resulting from these agreements as to justify, perhaps, the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] that the courts of the country, as well as this commission, are inadequate to deal with the evil.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. HARDWICK. I asked that question. I did not make it in the form of a suggestion.

Mr. THOMAS. I stand corrected. I refer to the inquiry of the Senator, and not his suggestion.

Mr. HARDWICK. Does the Senator think, because the law fails in one particular in its administration, that that is an indictment of the law itself, or of the courts generally?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not.

Mr. HARDWICK. Why can we not enforce the law against these people?

Mr. THOMAS. I think, however, that if the law fails in one direction and then fails in another direction, so that it becomes valueless, it is the duty of the lawmaker to see to it that the purpose expressed in it be made effective by laws strengthening and confirming those already in existence, but of demonstrated ineffectiveness.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield further?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. HARDWICK. The laws to which the Senator refers were laws against combinations in restraint of trade, commonly called trusts?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. HARDWICK. Now, because those laws are not enforced by some particular court or in some particular instance is that a reason, according to the Senator's way of looking at things, for abandoning the system, and saying that the system is inadequate?

Mr. THOMAS. If there were but one failure, no; but if, through series of years, the laws, through the operations of the courts, their constructions—

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. And delays.

Mr. THOMAS (continuing). And delays, prove inadequate for the purpose, in consequence of which the interests affected may in some instances be brought to the verge of ruin and in others across the verge, then I think further legislation is essential; and I think that if ever there was a case about which there seems to be no dispute as to its facts it is the case with which this joint resolution proposes to deal.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I should like to understand that. Will the Senator explain to me why that is true? Is it because some particular district court will not enforce the law?

Mr. THOMAS. It is because the Trade Commission has confessed its inability to deal with it.

Mr. HARDWICK. Well, that would not be very important.

Mr. THOMAS. It is also because, up to this time, the courts have failed to deal with it properly and effectively. That is why I make the statement. It may be an inadequate reason; doubtless it is, in the judgment of my distinguished friend from Georgia; but to my mind it is convincing. If there were no war pending, and this situation addressed itself to my judgment in times of peace, accompanied by this sort of a report, and the Committee on Printing saw fit to offer such a joint resolution, I think I would support it, not because it presents the best remedy in the world, not because it is desirable, but because it seems to be the one essential step which the Government must

take, if it is taken at all, to remedy the evil, since the power does not exist elsewhere, and which, in my judgment, it ought to take, in view of the fact that we have heretofore assumed charge of the general trust question, and to legislate nationally regarding it.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, does it bother the Senator for me to interrupt him?

Mr. THOMAS. Not at all, although my voice is not in as good condition as I would like.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will not interrupt the Senator if he prefers not to be interrupted.

Mr. THOMAS. It is all right; I am perfectly willing to be.

Mr. HARDWICK. Would the Senator, then, applying that principle, be willing to abandon the laws against trusts and combinations in every line of industry and of business where some court or several courts have failed to administer them according to his ideas?

Mr. THOMAS. That is a very pertinent question.

Mr. HARDWICK. That is what it means, I think.

Mr. THOMAS. In every instance like the one under consideration that is brought to our attention; yes. I do not know that we should go hunting for them; but where they are brought, as this is brought, to our attention, and where the record is so one-sided as this seems to be, that is our relief or we have none.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. HARDWICK. Applying the same line of reasoning, then, to the Standard Oil Co. case or the American Tobacco Co. case, or any one of the cases where this has happened, where a dissolution was decreed by the courts and such a reorganization was effected by the corporation or corporations involved that in the opinion of many people the dissolution decree did not amount to very much, would the Senator then be in favor of Government ownership and operation in those fields?

Mr. THOMAS. The dissolution of the Standard Oil Co. and of the American Tobacco Co. resulted merely in a transformation of the companies and the continuation of their businesses ostensibly by separate concerns, but I imagine really by the same general control. In each of those instances the law, although applied, failed to accomplish the object desired. With regard to the Standard Oil Co., however, it has relieved the producing end of the oil business from that monopoly which previously existed. But I will say to the Senator that whenever it shall appear to the Congress, as it appears in this case, that either of those companies or any other companies controlling a large majority of the business make an agreement like this, we should treat the situation just as we propose to treat this, unless it be possible to suggest something equally effective, which up to this time the genius of man does not seem to have discovered.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield again, why is not the enforcement of the statute laws, as written, better?

Mr. THOMAS. If the statute laws as written—and I speak now of the antitrust acts rather than of the Federal Trade Commission act, which I do not think that we should have adopted in its present form—can be enforced so as to produce the result desired; yes. They never have been, however, and even in cases where they have been successfully applied the resultant has been merely a change of appearances while the substance of the thing sought to be destroyed has continued.

Perhaps it might be well, if it could be done by legislative enactment, to place concerns like these in the hands of a receiver until they shall conform to the requirements of the law as written and conduct their business in a lawful manner; but we can not appoint receivers by legislation. That is a judicial act; and while I do not intend to reflect upon the courts, I may be pardoned for expressing some skepticism with regard to their general attempted enforcements of this and kindred legislation. I do not in the slightest degree impugn their integrity in calling attention to the fact that with the refined constructions and exceptions and differences and distinctions with which all of the decisions upon these antitrust laws fairly bristle no man knows what he can do nor what he should refrain from doing, the law to-day being in a greater state of unsettlement than it was when judicial construction first began.

Mr. President, I do not believe in governmental control or in Government ownership per se. I am satisfied that private operation of business of all kinds, except it be with regard to public utilities, is eminently preferable to governmental control or interference. I think everyone will agree to that. But I believe in Government control in certain instances, of which this is one, when it appears to be the last alternative, without the exercise of which the evil complained of may be aggravated

instead of diminished, until those who are its victims shall be stripped of all their possessions.

My friend the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] the other day deprecated the constantly growing tendency of all interests and of all individuals to appeal to Congress and the General Government for relief against recurring evils of which they complain, whereas two or three generations ago, under the then prevailing spirit and genius and individualism, each man depended largely upon his own resources to work out his own salvation. Unfortunately, that is true; and in that tendency my friend the Senator from Georgia can find the germ of that departure from State rights which he deprecates so earnestly and so mournfully. The States, for the most part, have lost their rights because they preferred to surrender them to the General Government in consideration of that Government's bearing the financial burden of their exercise.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. THOMAS. I do.

Mr. LEWIS. Does not the Senator think that those privileges have been too often surrendered for financial favors and benefits?

Mr. THOMAS. That is exactly what I say. With the editorial read by the Senator from Georgia a few moments ago I have no quarrel, except that the condition which the editor of that paper bewails is not a condition created by the adoption of the prohibition resolution or by the passage yesterday in the House of Representatives of the suffrage resolution. Those were merely its latest manifestations. It has been going on constantly for the last generation. The States have not expressly, perhaps not intentionally, but have constantly shifted their rights, their duties, and their obligations from themselves to the General Government in exchange for appropriations. I recall that it was the proudest boast of one of the Senator's most distinguished predecessors on this floor that during his long career in the House and the Senate he never asked for or received a dollar of appropriation for the benefit of his State. But that was long, long ago. The Senator who pursues such a policy now would retain his seat not longer than the expiration of his term.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. HARDWICK. I think the Senator's statement is inaccurate, with due respect.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, it may be. I am not infallible.

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not think the Senator can instance a single case in which the States have voluntarily surrendered rights for appropriations—not of the South, at least; not Georgia, I know.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, it is the duty of the States to build their own roads and to improve their own water highways, except in instances where navigation—actual navigation, not navigability—is involved. The States, North and South, have long ago shifted that burden—not only shifted it but imposed it—upon the Treasury of the United States, until to-day the old doctrine that the States or the riparian proprietors were the owners of the waters of the streams, and certainly of nonnavigable streams, and of the beds thereof, has disappeared.

Mr. HARDWICK. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. THOMAS. Such are the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. HARDWICK. No; it has not disappeared there, either.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator is mistaken, and I think if he will examine the question as carefully as I have had occasion to do he will find that I am right. A citizen of my State can not secure the granting of a permit to divert water for irrigation in a nonnavigable stream without the permission of the Secretary of War, who must determine whether such diversion in any way impairs the navigability of the stream of which it is a tributary.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will pardon me, that is a very different question from the proposition to which the Senator was alluding.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, no; that is the legitimate outcome of it.

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not think so at all. That is navigability only. The ownership question has not been determined by the courts.

Mr. THOMAS. The ownership has been asserted and sustained by the Supreme Court in many cases growing out of the insistence by the State upon its right to dispose of, or of its citizens to own, the power generated by the water of these navigable streams, which has nothing whatever to do with navigability. The same is true of the public roads. Ninety per cent of the matters involved in our agricultural bills for which appropriations are asked and received are peculiarly within, and ought to be within, State jurisdiction. But inasmuch as the

Government makes appropriations for them it follows as a matter of course that the rights have been shifted, until they are no longer recognized as a part and parcel of the rights of the States.

Why, Mr. President, in these days a great calamity can not occur in any of the States involving the destruction of property or loss of life, but that an appeal is instantly made to the General Government for financial and other relief, which is granted as a matter of course, but which should not form the subject of appropriations from the Federal Treasury under the old doctrine of State rights. We have progressed, and we are progressing, and we will progress until every right of the States—and there are not many left—will, in all probability, be absorbed by the General Government in exchange for fat appropriations from the Public Treasury.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. THOMAS. I do.

Mr. HARDWICK. I hate to disturb the Senator, but I do not like to have him make a statement of that sort without my correcting it.

Mr. THOMAS. My remarks, of course, do not bind the Senator.

Mr. HARDWICK. Oh, no; not at all. The Senator is usually very accurate in his statements, and as a general proposition he is accurate about this, but I want to take this occasion to call attention to the fact that recently one of the great cities of my State was almost totally destroyed by fire. It did not ask for one cent's aid of any sort from the Federal Government, and it is one of the boasts of the people that they did not do it, although they were almost ruined. I refer to the city of Augusta. So that the Senator can not make a general indictment of the kind he is making, which may be applicable to some of the States, without my insisting that the State of Georgia is an exception to it.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, Mr. President, one swallow does not make a summer.

Mr. HARDWICK. But the Senator started out to establish a proposition on which he has cited nothing; namely, that the States themselves have voluntarily renounced their rights and duties in order to get these appropriations.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, of course, that is a difference of contention between the Senator and myself. He does not think so. I do.

Mr. HARDWICK. I can not think of an instance where the States themselves have asked for these things. The Senator speaks of the change about internal improvements. The States themselves did not ask for that to be done. The people determined that here in Congress through their representatives.

Mr. THOMAS. The States are represented in Congress by Senators and by Representatives. They presumably voice, and I think they generally voice, the wishes of their constituents; and a general principle or a general condition once established, the fact that in one or two instances, or in the case of one or two States, there have not been observable the things to which I referred does not, I think, militate against the general proposition. Ever since the end of the war between the States this country has been marching constantly, and sometimes with accelerated speed, toward centralized government. The things to which the Senator referred as indicating that fact—the child-labor legislation, the legislation of similar import which from time to time has been adopted by this body, and I occupied and still occupy the same position with regard to the child-labor law that my friend from Georgia does—all are in my judgment the legitimate outgrowth of the original tendencies of the States to avoid the financial obligations which the exercise of their original duties involved. The assumption of these powers by the General Government has been sustained by the decisions of the courts of last resort, which in all probability will sustain the constitutionality of the law to which he and I have just referred.

These are the prevailing conditions, Mr. President; and I think that future historians will regard them as the outgrowth of the necessities which have arisen from our expanding population, from the multiplication of our business activities, and from the general progress of society from one stage of political and industrial activity to another.

I think it has been inevitable from the foundation of this Government that ultimately the General Government would absorb many functions of the States hitherto regarded as attributes of their sovereignty. The other day the Supreme Court of the United States, in what is popularly known as the Utah power case, determined that the States in which the public domain still exists were powerless to legislate concerning or to interfere with any policy of the General Government regard-

ing that domain. It has gone so far, although it has not said so in exact words, as to deny the existence of the sovereign power of eminent domain with regard to the public lands in the States, a power which Mr. Calhoun, as I stated the other day, very truly declared to be one of the inseparable attributes of sovereignty.

I do not expect, Mr. President, in the short time I have to live, to see any change, unless it be one of accelerated progress in the centralizing tendencies of the Government through congressional legislation and judicial construction.

Mr. President, just another reflection with regard to this bill and for the present I am through. My support of the joint resolution is dictated by the belief and by the conviction that without it the unfortunate condition outlined in the report will be aggravated. I have no particular love for the newspaper fraternity, particularly some of them in my section of the country, but justice is justice, whether it be applied to one class in a community or to another. They are all entitled to the same treatment under the law. Newspaper print is an essential to our general everyday life. To my mind, the dissemination of news is quite as important as the dissemination of food. That which interferes with it, especially in war times, may rise to the dignity of a national calamity.

That, however, is not the only interest which this combination injures or at which it is aimed. It is aimed at all those who have use for its product, and that virtually comprises the entire country, the men and women and children composing that aggregate community which we call the United States.

It seems to me, therefore, Mr. President, to be of sufficient importance, considered as a national question, to demand, after this investigation and failure of the Trade Commission, the due consideration of the Congress of the United States. The joint resolution, therefore, is one which is designed to supplement the power of the Trade Commission by extending it so far as to enable it, if the President shall so determine, to supervise, control, and regulate the production and distribution of print paper and mechanical and chemical pulp. It is the taking of a long step forward, and the pertinent inquiry has been made as to whether the same conditions do not justify similar action in other directions. I think they do.

Mr. President, I believe the Food Commission should have been armed at the outset with the power not only to determine the prices of the necessities of life to the producer, but also the retail prices to the consumer. We know that at the present time a large proportion of the public are taking advantage of the war, and of the scarcity in the necessities of life which the war has produced, to make large sums of money and prodigious profits out of the everyday requirements of the citizen. That is true all over the United States and it is eminently true in the District of Columbia. This center of the Nation is inhabited by the most avaricious, the most grasping, and the most unscrupulous set of business buccaneers that can be found anywhere on the face of the globe.

Take the matter of rent, of groceries, of fuel, of all the things which minister not only to the comfort but to the actualities of existence, and the faces of not only the poor but the well-to-do and the rich are being ground more and more as the days pass; and Congress, which is the common council of the District of Columbia, has so far done nothing to check or control it.

I wish we could extend this resolution so as to include those evils, rectify them, do away with them if possible. Of course, under existing law nothing can be done, but is there anyone here who denies that it ought to be done?

The only proposal so far made is to meet it by increasing the compensation of Government officials. That is merely using the Government officials as a conduit to convey more money of the Treasury into the hands of the modern purveyors in this city particularly, as well as all over the country. My prediction now is that unless we legislate along analogous lines to meet this difficulty any increases in salary will simply be followed by a corresponding increase in the cost of the necessities of life. We recall that in 1909 Congress placed an added duty of 10 cents a box upon lemons and oranges at the behest of the growers of California. The President had hardly approved the act until the railroad companies increased their freight rate just enough to absorb that 10 cents tariff increase. That is what has been done here and what will be done until we shall interfere in earnest.

I am actuated, Mr. President, let me say in conclusion, by no sort of feeling, of which I am conscious, of prejudice against or animosity to the people who will be affected by this resolution. They are doing what a great many others are doing, and we are very apt, all of us, to justify wrongdoing by referring to the fact that the practice is common, that others do it, and therefore we are justified in following their example.

I am not advocating this measure through any animosity toward the so-called capitalistic class. I do not believe this is a capitalistic war. The charge is an infamous slander or else it is made in total ignorance of the facts. The wealth of this country has responded to the needs of the Nation, both in its contributions of money and of men, to a degree that commands my sincere admiration and entitles it to the grateful thanks of the Republic. But, of course, there are exceptions in all cases, and among these exceptions are these profiteers, whose monstrous conduct has made it necessary for the Government to bring forward this resolution, which I hope will be passed.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to the following agreement, fixing a time for a final vote on the joint resolution. I understand that under the rule a quorum has to be present, and therefore I shall ask after the reading of the proposed agreement that the roll be called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona submits a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT.

It is agreed by unanimous consent that at not later than 5 o'clock p. m. on the calendar day of Tuesday, January 15, 1918, the Senate will proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon S. J. Res. 101, a joint resolution to provide further for the national security and defense by insuring to the Government of the United States an adequate supply of print paper at a fair price, etc., through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition; and that after the hour of 2 o'clock p. m. on said calendar day no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon the joint resolution or more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In order to present the proposed agreement for consideration by the Senate a quorum will be necessary. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, at this juncture let me inform the Senate of the absence of Senators who are members of the Interstate Commerce Committee, the Committee on Manufactures, and the Committee on Military Affairs, caused by the fact that each of those committees now have investigations before them calling for the attendance of the members of the committees.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Swanson
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Owen	Thomas
Fernald	Jones, Wash.	Phelan	Tillman
France	Kenyon	Pittman	Trammell
Frelinghuysen	King	Pol Dexter	Vardaman
Gallinger	Kirby	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Gerry	Lewis	Reed	Warren
Hale	Lodge	Shaforth	Weeks
Harding	McCumber	Sheppard	Williams
Hardwick	McNary	Sherman	Wolcott
Hitchcock	Martin	Smith, Ariz.	
James	Nelson	Smith, Md.	
Johnson, Cal.	New	Smoot	

Mr. LEWIS. In making the announcement I neglected to do the justice to the Committee on Commerce to state that their members are also absent, caused by an investigation pending before that committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I ask that the proposed unanimous-consent agreement may be again read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read it.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT.

It is agreed by unanimous consent that at not later than 5 o'clock p. m. on the calendar day of Tuesday, January 15, 1918, the Senate will proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon S. J. Res. 101, a joint resolution to provide further for the national security and defense by insuring to the Government of the United States an adequate supply of paper at a fair price and by insuring a supply and equitable distribution at fair prices to the industries of the United States through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition; and that after the hour of 2 o'clock p. m. on said calendar day no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon the joint resolution or more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed agreement submitted by the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. REED. I ask the Senator from Arizona if the joint resolution can not be printed with all the amendments so that it will be before us in the morning?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The joint resolution has been printed and all the amendments that have been offered have been printed, so that it is now before the Senate in just the form the Senator desires. It is the desire of Senators that we may vote upon the joint resolution on Tuesday in order that the Senate may

recess over to-morrow. That will give Monday and Tuesday for the consideration of the measure, extending not later than 5 o'clock on Tuesday.

Mr. REED. I have been absent on committee work, and I have not been here since the joint resolution has been printed, but I understand it has been amended in many respects.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. No vote has been taken on any amendment. All the amendments that have been offered have been printed.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I would not have any objection to the limitation of debate beginning at 2 o'clock on Tuesday and to a vote being taken on that calendar day, but we had a unanimous-consent agreement here just a few days ago similar to this one, and when 5 o'clock came there were a great many very important amendments presented and not a word of debate or explanation could be heard upon them.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. What was the cause of that?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It was simply because the time between 2 o'clock and 5 o'clock was taken up with the consideration of other amendments, and when the hour of 5 o'clock arrived a lot of amendments that had not been discussed or explained or anything of the sort were presented. I do not believe the Senate ought to put itself in that sort of a position. I would be perfectly willing that on Tuesday next after 2 o'clock the debate should be limited to 10 minutes, and that we shall vote on the calendar day. In that way we would not reach a time when amendments would be offered without any opportunity to explain them.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I have no objection to that modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the modification proposed by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That instead of 5 o'clock the vote shall be taken on that calendar day?

Mr. SMOOT. On the calendar day of Tuesday.

Mr. GALLINGER. Some time during the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The agreement will be read as modified.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT.

It is agreed by unanimous consent that on the calendar day of Tuesday, January 15, 1918, the Senate will proceed to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon Senate joint resolution 101, a joint resolution to provide further for the national security and defense by insuring to the Government of the United States an adequate supply of paper at a fair price and by insuring a supply and equitable distribution at fair prices to the industries of the United States through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition; and that after the hour of 2 o'clock p. m. on said calendar day no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon the joint resolution or more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona if he would not be willing to make it Wednesday instead of Tuesday. Some of us are tied down with committee work.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I will agree to make it any day in the week that will suit Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed modification will be stated.

The Secretary read as follows:

It is agreed, by unanimous consent, that on Wednesday, January 16—

Mr. LODGE. I withdraw the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The suggested modification is withdrawn.

Mr. STONE. I ask if Senators will not agree that after 2 o'clock on Tuesday debate shall be limited to 10 minutes on the joint resolution and the amendments pending and offered up to 5 o'clock, and that thereafter a vote on the final passage of the joint resolution shall be taken during the calendar day.

Mr. SMOOT. The hour of 5 o'clock has been eliminated.

Mr. STONE. Let the proposed agreement be read again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the agreement as it now stands modified.

The Secretary read as follows:

It is agreed, by unanimous consent, that on the calendar day of Tuesday, January 15, 1918, the Senate will proceed to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon S. J. Res. 101, a joint resolution to provide further for the national security and defense by insuring to the Government of the United States an adequate supply of paper at a fair price and by insuring a supply and equitable distribution at fair prices to the industries of the United States, through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition; and that after the hour of 2 o'clock p. m. on said calendar day no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon the joint resolution or more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

Mr. STONE. The point I have in mind is that we shall vote on the calendar day of January 15, and that after 2 o'clock on that day there shall be no debate by any Senator exceeding

10 minutes, and so forth. There is no limitation whatsoever placed in the order as read as to the time when there may be a final vote upon the bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. During that day.

Mr. SMOOT. At 12 o'clock at night the day ends.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. We are to vote on that calendar day.

Mr. SMOOT. Not the legislative day, but the calendar day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and it is entered into.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. SWANSON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3235) amending section 32, Federal farm-loan act, approved July 17, 1916.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. MARTIN. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 14, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION.

Executive nomination received by the Senate January 11, 1918.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY.

Paymaster Christian J. Peoples to be a pay director in the Navy with the rank of rear admiral from the first day of July, 1917.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 11, 1918.

CHIEF OF BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS.

Civil Engineer Charles W. Parks, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral for a term of four years.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

George I. Smith to be receiver of public moneys at Portland, Oreg.

Richard R. Turner to be receiver of public moneys at Roseburg, Oreg.

James P. Folger to be receiver of public moneys at Evanston, Wyo.

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Mrs. Mary Wolfe Dargin to be register of the land office at Denver, Colo.

Alex Nisbet to be register of the land office at Evanston, Wyo.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, January 11, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, who hast compassed the pathway of our life from the beginning, we thank Thee that Thy Providence abides through every change, which has given to us our homes, and all that makes them dear; our Government, with its glorious institutions.

May the memory of those who died that it might live, inspire us to loyalty, deepen our patriotism, that it may abide through all time, and be a blessing to untold generations yet to come.

Let Thy blessing descend upon these Representatives of the people. Give to them patience, courage, wisdom, that they may adjust all questions which may present themselves, to Thy will; and all praise and gratitude be Thine, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WATER-POWER COMMITTEE.

Mr. **POU**. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I present the following privileged report, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 216.

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to appoint a special committee of 18 members to whom all bills and resolutions hereafter introduced during the Sixty-fifth Congress pertaining to the development or utilization of water power shall be referred (notwithstanding any general rule of the House to the contrary), except, however, bills and resolutions of which the Committee on Foreign Affairs has jurisdiction under the general rules of the House.

Resolved further, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be, and it is hereby, discharged from further consideration of H. R. 3808, H. R. 7695, H. R. 4504, H. R. 8005, and S. 1419, and said bills are hereby referred to the special committee herein provided for; that the Committee on Public Lands is discharged from further consideration of H. R. 7227, and the same is hereby referred to the special committee aforesaid; that the chairman of said special committee be, and he is hereby, empowered to appoint a clerk subject to its approval.

Mr. **SANFORD**. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the resolution upon the ground that this committee has no privilege to report a resolution providing for the appointment of a clerk. The Committee on Rules has no special privilege to report any such resolution. At the conclusion of the resolution which has just been read appears the following:

that the chairman of said special committee be, and he is hereby, empowered to appoint a clerk subject to its approval.

Mr. **POU**. The resolution does not provide for any appropriation.

Mr. **SANFORD**. The Committee on Rules has certain privileges to report resolutions, but among those privileges is not the privilege to provide for the appointment of a clerk to a committee. Section 56 of Rule XI:

The following-named committees shall have leave to report at any time on the matters herein stated, viz: The Committee on Rules, on rules, joint rules, and order of business.

It seems to me too plain for argument that the matter of this resolution does not come within that privilege.

Mr. **POU**. Mr. Speaker, on the contrary, it seems to me that it is too plain for argument that the point of the gentleman from New York is not well taken. The provision in the resolution which has just been reported does not provide for any appropriation. It is a controverted point, at least among some of the best parliamentarians of the House, as to whether or not it would destroy the privileged character of a resolution if it did carry an appropriation, but the Committee on Rules was particular in drafting the resolution in respect to the wording not to incorporate any provision that carried an appropriation.

The **SPEAKER**. What does the gentleman say about the point that is made by the gentleman from New York that the Committee on Rules is not authorized to bring in a rule about a clerk?

Mr. **POU**. My reply to that is I do not think it is well taken. A clerk is a necessary and essential part in the make-up of a committee, a part of the necessary machinery of a committee.

Mr. **GARRETT** of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **POU**. Yes.

Mr. **GARRETT** of Tennessee. The general rules of the House provide that each regular standing committee shall have a clerk. This is a special order. There is nothing unusual about this. Every resolution in all the years that has been brought in providing for special committees of investigation has always carried a provision that the committee should have the right to select such clerical aid as it might need. At times the resolution has provided that the committee might employ lawyers. It has never been held that that destroys the privileged character of the resolution. It has been held, however, that if the resolution carries an appropriation it destroys the privileged character of it.

Mr. **POU**. It would be an anomalous situation if the Committee on Rules had the power to bring in a report creating a committee and yet did not have authority to provide machinery for the necessary work of that committee.

Mr. **TOWNER**. Mr. Speaker, of course primarily I think the question is a question of privilege; that is, as to whether or not the Committee on Rules has a right to report this as a privileged rule. The provision with regard to the privilege character of reports from the Committee on Rules is that the Committee on Rules shall have the right to report at any time—on rules, joint rules, and order of business.

That denominates the privileged character of the rule. It does not denominate the character of the rule, but its privileged character. This is sought to be brought before the House at this time as a privileged rule—that is, with the right to re-

port it at any time—but it is neither a rule nor is it a joint rule, nor does it refer to the order of business. It is constructive; it reports a new rule. It reports something that will require further action of the House. It seems to me that it is quite clear that it can not be within the things that are denominated as privileged, and that the committee has no right to bring in this rule at this time.

Mr. **LENROOT**. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. **TOWNER**] has just said, this is a new rule; that is what it amounts to. I call the attention of the Chair to section 666 of the General Rules of the House, page 291:

The chairman shall appoint the clerk or clerks or other employees of his committee, subject to its approval, who shall be paid at the public expense, the House having first provided therefor.

The rules of the House do deal with the matter of a clerk. Under the rules of the House, the House must first provide for a clerk before the chairman can appoint one. It seems to me that it would be competent to change the rule in that particular, and it would not destroy the privilege if a rule were introduced changing the rule in that particular and permitting the chairman to appoint.

Mr. **CRAMTON**. Mr. Speaker, I find in the compilation of forms, section 931, in the House Manual, for "resolutions providing for investigations" that the form includes the statement that "the expenses incurred shall be paid upon vouchers approved by the chairman," and so forth, out of certain funds. The note with reference to it states that "the provision for payment of expenses out of the contingent fund is more properly made the subject of a separate resolution, which should be considered by the Committee on Accounts, while the portion ordering the investigation is considered by the Committee on Rules. But frequently the Committee on Rules reports on both propositions, although their report in such a case is necessarily subject to a point of order."

The gentleman from Tennessee, it seems to me, was urging this matter of privilege by reason of the fact that necessarily expenditures must be made by such a special committee, and among other expenses would be a clerk. This quotation makes it clear, so far as it may be authority, that general authority for expenditures would not be permitted in a resolution from the Rules Committee if objection were made. If the authorization for general expenditure would not be in order, it seems only reasonable that the expenditure for a clerk could not be authorized by the Rules Committee without making this resolution subject to a point of order.

The **SPEAKER**. Where is the gentleman reading from?

Mr. **CRAMTON**. Page 447 of the House Manual, in connection with the form of resolution providing for an investigation.

Mr. **STAFFORD**. Mr. Speaker, if the contention of the gentleman or the members of the Committee on Rules is correct, then they would have the right in this connection to authorize the appointment not only of a clerk but an assistant clerk or any number of secretarial force for that committee they desired.

Mr. **SANFORD**. Including janitors?

Mr. **STAFFORD**. Including janitors and messengers; and yet we know that even at this session of Congress, when the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. **POU**] introduced a resolution providing for the appointment of an additional clerk as an assistant to his committee, it was referred to the Committee on Accounts. If his committee had had the right under the rules of the House to appoint a clerk, it would have had the right necessarily to appoint every other kind of official that the committee saw fit to recommend; but under the rules of the House, as interpreted by the Chair and the practice of this House, that privilege has always belonged to the Committee on Accounts. I cite to you, Mr. Speaker, the authority found in Hinds' Precedents, paragraph 4534. Of course, the authority referred to by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. **GARRETT**], that the chairman appoint the clerk, is not inconsistent with the position taken by the gentleman from New York [Mr. **SANFORD**], that the original authority of appointment vests in the Committee on Accounts. After the Committee on Accounts gives the authority for the appointment of the clerk, then, necessarily, the operating effect of the rule, that the chairman shall appoint, begins. Now, referring to paragraph 4534 of Hinds' Precedents:

An annual clerkship of a committee is authorized by a resolution reported by the Committee on Accounts and agreed to by the House.

That is the heading as framed by Mr. Hinds.

On August 23, 1888, Mr. M. M. Boothman, of Ohio, from the Committee on Accounts, presented for the action of the House this resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries be allowed an annual clerk, to be paid out of the contingent funds of the House, until March 3, 1889, at the rate of \$2,000 per annum; and the Committee on Appropriations is hereby instructed to make provision for such clerk at the said rate of \$2,000 per annum, from said March 3, 1889."

Mr. Speaker, the mere fact that the Committee on Rules has authority to create a new committee, which is a rule of the House, does not give the committee the right to present a rule providing for a clerkship, for which authority is granted to the Committee on Accounts. That destroys the privileged character of it as pointed out by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER]. It only has authority and privilege to present resolutions prescribing rules, joint rules, or order of business. It has no authority if the Committee on Accounts has that privilege to authorize a clerk, otherwise it would have had the right the other day to have brought in here a rule providing for an assistant clerk for its own committee. But no, under the interpretation of the rules of the House that resolution was referred to the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. Well, if the proposition to create an assistant clerk stood by itself, if it stood by itself after this special committee had been created, it would undoubtedly go to the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. STAFFORD. The mere fact is that time does not affect the character of the authority. The committee not having that authority in the instance given by me as to their own committee would not have authority as a matter of privilege to provide it for some other committee.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, there is one section of Hinds' Precedents that seems to me more in point than any one heretofore cited. That is section 4332. The heading is:

The assignment of committee clerks is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Accounts.

And the paragraph reads:

On December 17, 1869, the House agreed to a resolution that all propositions providing for committee clerks be referred to the Committee on Accounts before being acted on, and this was also the practice in 1877, when the resolutions assigning committee clerks were reported from this committee, and has continued the practice.

The SPEAKER. Now, what does the gentleman conclude?

Mr. MAPES. I conclude that that part of this resolution providing for a committee clerk coming from the Committee on Rules is not in order. That must go to the Committee on Accounts. The Committee on Accounts is the only committee, according to this section, that has jurisdiction over the assignment to or the creation of a clerk for a committee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the authority which the gentleman has just cited evidently applies to those cases where clerks are to be provided for committees already in existence, and only to that.

Now, a very learned and witty judge in my State once said that common sense is always good law, though good law may not always be common sense. I think that is true of parliamentary law as well as other law. And what is the common sense of this proposition? Here is a proposition submitted to the House—and the House can determine whether or not it desires to adopt it—to create a special committee. That carries with it by the resolution the authority to appoint a clerk. The committee must have a clerk if it is to be selected. It does not provide the appropriation. The Committee on Accounts will have to attend to that. That is the part of it with which the Committee on Accounts must deal, namely, fixing the compensation of the clerk. This is merely a complete piece of machinery provided in the rule, and why should that not be as a matter of common sense? In the absence of any direct decisions upon the matter, and inasmuch as the Chair must blaze the way, it seems to me—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I did not mean to say, Mr. Speaker, that the committee would be entitled to a clerk under the general rules of the House. I do not think so. The committee did not think so; and hence it inserted the provision that it should have a clerk.

Why, Mr. Speaker, if the Chair should hold that that destroys the privileged character of the resolution, let me call attention to future complications that will arise. In almost every Congress there occurs the necessity for creating special committees for this purpose or for that, very often for purposes of investigation.

We have had numerous investigating committees, namely, the Stanley steel committee and the Hardwick sugar committee, the Mulhall committee, investigating the lobby charges, and so forth. In each and every instance the Committee on Rules, in bringing in the resolution providing for the selection of the special committee, has provided that those committees should have the right to employ such clerical and other assistance as they might need, frequently giving the power to employ counsel. Now, if the chair should hold that that is not privileged, see what complications it would bring about in the effort to create even the machinery necessary in the operation of special committees in the future.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. Assuming that the provision in the rule authorizing the appointment of a new committee, or a select committee, for the appointment of a clerk or the employment of counsel, would destroy its privileged character, following out the suggestion made by the gentleman that common sense should be good law, is it to be presumed that the Committee on Accounts, which has undoubted authority to provide for the employment of a clerk, or authorize the employment of counsel, would refuse to do its duty in giving to that committee the proper authority?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Oh, I do not think so. The gentleman evidently did not understand what I had in mind. I am simply striving to obtain the simplest methods of reaching a result, and that is the simplest method.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, of course. The simplest method would be to vest the power in the Committee on Rules—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Oh, no.

Mr. STAFFORD. And deprive the Committee on Accounts of some of its authority.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Oh, not at all. The Committee on Rules is not usurping any authority and could not usurp any authority if it wanted to do so. The Committee on Rules can not do anything except what this House wants it to do. That has been demonstrated several times recently. The matter, I think, is of considerable importance in that it affects the procedure of the House, and this is the plain, simple way to get at the result, which is, of course, desirable. Otherwise you would have to take two or three different bites of the cherry.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I submit one additional observation. It is admitted that the Committee on Rules has the right to present a rule changing the rules of the House. The creation of a new committee is undoubtedly a subject for a privileged report. Now, whatever is necessarily a part of that committee properly comes, I submit, within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules. If it is necessary for that committee to have a clerk, the provision authorizing the employment of such clerk does not destroy the privileged character of the resolution. The question is, Where does the line of demarcation come? Whatever is essential to the creation of the proposed committee properly belongs to the Committee on Rules. Whatever is not essential or necessary destroys the privileged character of a report. An appropriation, it has been held, would destroy such privilege.

But in the creation of a committee, if the Chair shall be of opinion that a clerk is essential and necessary in the work of that committee, then the provision empowering the committee to have such clerk does not destroy privileged character.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POU. Yes.

Mr. SANFORD. Does the gentleman contend that the Committee on Rules could report a rule providing for a disbursement out of the contingent fund?

Mr. POU. I do not.

Mr. SANFORD. Why not, then, if you can bring in any resolution you want changing the rules?

Mr. POU. I have tried to make myself plain. The point I am making is that whatever is essential to the creation of this committee does not deprive the resolution of its privileged character.

Mr. SANFORD. Does the gentleman consider this further—does not the gentleman think the payment of a clerk is just as essential as the appointment of a clerk?

Mr. POU. Not in the sense in which I am speaking.

Mr. SANFORD. The gentleman does not rely on common sense, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] suggested.

Mr. POU. Yes; I rely on parliamentary common sense, and I think the gentleman himself comprehends very clearly the point I make, that if the appointment of a clerk is an essential part of the initial creation of this committee, then it is competent for the Committee on Rules to bring in this provision. That is the point I am making.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, if the Chair will indulge me for the citation of some further authorities, I will call his attention to paragraph 4331 of Hinds' Precedents, bearing on this subject, the heading being, "The Committee on Accounts recommends to the House resolutions authorizing and assigning clerks to committees." I will not read the paragraph following the heading. Paragraph 4332 says:

The assignment of committee clerks is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. Does not that derive entirely out of the general and specific rules of the House that the House must provide for those clerks? And if there is a rule taking it out

of the general rules of the House, none of that which the gentleman has read will apply.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is nothing in the rules of the House to the effect that the House must provide for clerks. I take issue with the position of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] that a clerk is absolutely necessary for the performance of the duties of the committee. If that is the fact, then the Committee on Rules would not only have authority to appoint a clerk, but also an assistant clerk, and a janitor, or a messenger, or anything else, and the Committee on Accounts would be deprived of its proper jurisdiction.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman says that the rules of the House do not provide that the House shall make provision for a clerk. Section 5 of Rule X (paragraph 666 of the Manual) does expressly provide that—

The chairman shall appoint the clerk or clerks or other employees of his committee, subject to its approval, who shall be paid at the public expense, the House having first provided therefor.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course; "the House having first provided therefor." It confirms the very position I take—that before there is a clerk to a committee there must be an authorization given by some standing committee for the appointment of that clerk, and the proper committee to appoint that clerk or assistant clerk is the Committee on Accounts; and then, after the authorization is made by the proper committee, which is the Committee on Accounts, the chairman has the authority to appoint the clerk or other subordinate clerks.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman overlooks the fact that the Committee on Rules can report a rule at any time changing the rules of the House in that or any other particular.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, following that construction, the Committee on Rules would have the authority to report a rule at any time changing the rules of the House authorizing expenditures out of the contingent fund. It was contended always that that deprived a resolution of its privileged character, because that was in the exclusive power of the Committee on Accounts.

I direct the attention of the Speaker to the fact that in these prior authorizations, as, for instance, those for investigating committees, while they may have had authorizations providing for the employment of clerks or counsel, the point of order was never tested on the floor of the House. There is nothing to show that that character of legislation was debated in this House.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. It does not pretend to change the rules of the House. The rules of the House still exist, and they provide that propositions shall be reported to the House when new clerks are to be appointed.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is so. I wonder whether this new committee is to be provided with a janitor. If so, could there not be an authorization to appoint a janitor or messenger?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is there not a decided difference in the authority of the Committee on Rules to report to the House a change of rules and to make a report in disregard of the rules?

The SPEAKER. The point of order is sustained.

AMENDMENT TO THE FEDERAL FARM-LOAN ACT (H. REPT. NO. 237).

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conference report on Senate bill 3235 be presented to the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of order. Has this been printed under the rules?

Mr. GLASS. It is in the RECORD to-day. It is in the RECORD, and it has been acted on by the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GILLET. It is printed in the RECORD?

Mr. GLASS. It is printed in the RECORD.

Mr. GILLET. Is it printed in the House proceedings?

Mr. GLASS. No.

Mr. GILLET. Then, under the rule, Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that it can not be considered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not understand what the point was.

Mr. GILLET. That it has not been printed in the House proceedings, under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. GLASS. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that we may proceed with the consideration of the conference report and take it from the Speaker's table. The matter has been acted upon by the Senate. The Senate has receded from its disagreement and accepted the House bill in toto.

Mr. GILLET. I did not know what the House report was. If that is so, I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report, the rule to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Virginia if it is the farm-loan bill conference report?

Mr. GLASS. Yes; it is.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What, in substance, is the outline of the report? What did the conferees do?

Mr. GLASS. The Senate receded from its disagreement and accepted the House bill.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Without the Weeks amendment?

Mr. GLASS. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, what time is to be given for the consideration of this conference report?

Mr. GLASS. I did not suppose that anybody would want to speak on it again. The House bill was discussed for three hours under general debate and then under the five-minute rule, and the Senate has accepted the House bill in toto.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The time was very limited. I remember I succeeded in getting three minutes, by a great deal of exertion, when the matter was up before.

Mr. GLASS. If anybody desires further discussion on the matter, I shall raise no objection. The gentleman will recall that the House passed the House amendment by a vote of 3 to 1, and the Senate has now yielded.

Mr. GARNER. I was just going to ask about that. The Senate has yielded to the House amendment?

Mr. GLASS. The Senate has yielded, and has agreed to the conference report.

Mr. GARNER. Then there is nothing else to do.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It may be that further discussion is useless, but the matter was not discussed much before.

Mr. GLASS. I agree with the gentleman, and it was largely through my fault.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] rose to the parliamentary inquiry, but he was interrupted.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not understand that this was a conference report, and I merely wanted to ask whether it would destroy the right of the Invalid Pensions Committee to call up its bill.

The SPEAKER. Oh, no. The conference report has the right of way.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand that. As soon as I found that out, I withdrew my point.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3235) amending section 32, Federal farm-loan act, approved July 17, 1916, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same.

CARTER GLASS,
MICHAEL F. PHELAN,
EVERIS A. HAYES,

Managers on the part of the House.

ROBERT L. OWEN,
HENRY F. HOLLIS,
A. J. GRONNA,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. GLASS. I move the adoption of the conference report. The conference report was agreed to.

FISHING IN THE COLUMBIA RIVER—CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the reference of the bill (H. R. 2617) to ratify the compact and agreement between the States of Oregon and Washington regarding concurrent jurisdiction over the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries in connection with regulating, protecting, and preserving fish.

This bill was introduced by Mr. HADLEY, of Washington, at the first session of this Congress and was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. In the last Congress the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HADLEY] introduced the bill and it was referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fish-

eries, and was reported out of that committee and passed by the House. In the opinion of the committee the bill ought to go to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks to rerefer the bill to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed Senate bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3223. An act providing for the continuance of the Osage Indian School, Oklahoma, for a period of 13 years from January 1, 1918; and

S. 2052. An act authorizing the Sioux Tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3235) amending section 32, Federal farm-loan act, approved July 17, 1916.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below.

S. 3009. An act granting the consent of Congress to the P. M. C. Coal Co. to construct and maintain a bridge across Tug River, connecting Pike County, Ky., and Mingo County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PENSIONS.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 8496) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] will take the chair.

Mr. SHERLEY took the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Barbara F. Hicks, widow of Francis M. Hicks, late of Company G, Twenty-third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$37 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Allie Hicks, helpless and dependent child of said Francis M. Hicks, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Barbara F. Hicks, the name of said Allie Hicks shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Barbara F. Hicks.

The name of George W. Evans, late of Company E, Thirty-ninth Regiment, and Company H, Seventh Regiment, Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac B. Hawke, late of Company C, One hundred and eighty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Adam Wilson, late of Company A, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Kidd, late of Company L, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Armilda Hays, widow of William G. Hays, late of Company D, Fifteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$37 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of May B. Hays, helpless and dependent child of said William G. Hays, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Armilda Hays the name of said May B. Hays shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month, from and after the date of death of said Armilda Hays.

The name of George Barber, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John M. Sheldon, late of Company H, Thirteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Kate Hafer, helpless and dependent child of William Hafer, late of Company H, Eighty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Joel S. Stump, late of Company G, One hundred and fifty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Louis Auguste Zurcher, late of Company E, Twelfth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Patrick McDonnell, late of the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Norris C. Richmond, late of Company D, One hundred and twenty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac D. Nichols, late of Company A, battalion, Forty-eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Wymore, late of Company C, Fortieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Sanders, late of Company F, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$39 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel H. Smith, late of Company C, One hundred and thirty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Brenner, sr., late of Company D, Tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Susanna Rose, widow of George W. Rose, late of Company K, Fifty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$37 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Mary E. Rose, helpless and dependent child of said George W. Rose, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Susanna Rose the name of said Mary E. Rose shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Susanna Rose.

The name of Frederick Schwartz, late of Company K, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Birdwell, late of Company C, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas C. King, late of Company A, Thirty-ninth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alvin U. Persing, late of Company H, Eighty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Brumbaugh, late of Company I, Seventy-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Christopher Hummel, late of Company I, Seventeenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William C. McKelvy, late of Independent Battery E, Pennsylvania Volunteer Light Artillery, and Troop L, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John T. Bridgens, late of Company G, Two hundred and third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jonathan B. Rhodes, late of Company E, Twenty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John McDonald, alias William McKenzie, late of Company B, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sampson Sherwood, late of Company B, One hundred and ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry N. Yocum, late of Company H, Third Regiment, and Company I, Ninth Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peyton Johnson, late of Company D, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew P. Grubaugh, late of Company C, One hundred and sixty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Ervin, late of Company D, One hundred and ninety-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Q. Goss, late of Second Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John S. Bell, late of Company B, One hundred and ninety-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John J. West, late of Company G, Fifteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Vandine, late of Company C, Fifteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry C. Chaney, late of Company A, Junior Artillery, and First Regiment Maryland Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Randall M. Bates, late of Company D, One hundred and nineteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Bird C. Guffey, late of Company D, Forty-second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William B. Rogers, late of Company F, Forty-eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Oberon Payne, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Archibald W. Mayden, late of Company M, Sixteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Luther W. Holmes, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eva L. Phillips, helpless and dependent child of David O. Phillips, late of Company I, Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Simeon Flory, late of Company C, One hundred and seventy-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Drafted Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Riley, late of the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Josiah W. Lamb, late of Company I, Forty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nathaniel H. Guthery, late of Company D, Tenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin B. Cravens, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin M. Curtis, late of Company H, Forty-third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James W. Stine, late of Company F, Sixty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard H. Hughes, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Stephen Mullen, late of the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles W. Smith, alias James D. Miner, late of Company F, Third Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and Company H, Fourth Regiment New York Provisional Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank P. Lawrence, late of Company A, Twenty-second Regiment, and Company F, Thirty-ninth Regiment, Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William J. Shwimmer, late of Company G, First Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Luther Martin, late of Company D, One hundred and twenty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward M. Jurin, late of Company G, Seventieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew J. Buchanan, late of Company E, Thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Upton J. Hammond, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Eby, late of Company D, Fifty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rufus G. Cook, late of Company H, Thirty-first Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Craig, late of Company F, One hundred and twenty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Enos Pearce, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Wiltsey E. Silvers, late of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Pool, late of Companies E and C, Eleventh Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles W. Webster, late of Company F, One hundred and twenty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David McQuincy, late of Company G, Sixty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Mooneyham, late of the Eighty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Skrine, late of the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Routien, late of Company F, Third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elijah Walters, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Horton, late of Company B, Third Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nelson G. Mills, late of Company D, Seventieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Zedekiah Stapleton, late of Company A, Eighteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Timothy Kelley, late of Company K, Sixty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company A, Twentieth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward Van Kleeck, late of Company A, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of John Devine, late of Company E, Forty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Theodore Wilkins, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles A. Tucker, late of Company K, Thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph L. Killgore, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Morris Lincoln, late of Company K, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James B. Taylor, late of Company F, Thirty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hugh S. Stanley, late of Company F, Fifteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles W. A. Reynolds, late of Company I, One hundred and fortieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Amos Hales, late of Company B, Twenty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George L. Wells, late of Company A, One hundred and seventy-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Hennessy, late of Company F, One hundred and eighty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Otto Schellhorn, alias August Roessler, late of the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Layne, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Tennessee Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George L. Clapp, late of Company M, Twenty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cyrus S. Lyon, late of Company I, Twenty-seventh Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Columbus Massey, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. La Rue, late of Company A, Twenty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hiram Marshall, late of Company B, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John M. Stanley, late of Company D, One hundred and fifty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles T. Higgins, late of Company K, One hundred and ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hattie Kinkade, helpless and dependent child of Andrew Kinkade, late of Company D, Thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Noah W. Gerrish, late of Company H, Twenty-seventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert Booker, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles W. Bennett, late of Company K, Sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James S. Knighton, late of Company G, Seventy-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hiram Eells, late of Company C, Thirtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Perry Powers, late of Company E, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of De Forest Rutman, late of Company F, One hundred and ninety-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis J. McHaney, late of Company C, Thirty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Bethuel J. Goff, late of Company C, Eighty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph B. Rickart, late of Company D, Twenty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hiram Hine, late of Company D, Twenty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Absalom Shaeffer, late of Company E, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert P. Williams, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas J. Hughes, late of Company I, Twenty-second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alexander H. Reed, late of Company A, Second Regiment Colorado Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Arnold, late of Company D, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry A. Adcock, late of Company E, Thirty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William W. Porter, late of Company E, Eighteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Mathews, the widow of Dana Mathews, late of Company F, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Samuel Shoup, late of Company K, One hundred and second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Waterhouse, late of Company E, Third Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nathaniel C. Long, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment, and Company A, Tenth Regiment, Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas J. Trulock, late of Company C, One hundred and forty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Melvin Seward, late of Company A, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Loveman Place, late of Company A, Eighty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph H. Pillars, late of Company D, One hundred and eightieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Hedrick, late of Company C, One hundred and eighteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Uriah J. Favorite, late of Company G, One hundred and ninety-sixth Regiment, and unassigned, One hundred and eighty-seventh Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William C. Lawrence, late of Company H, One hundred and forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Christian Weisel, late of Company I, Eighty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas J. Westfall, late of Company E, Forty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob Bachman, late of Company I, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John R. Rice, late of Company I, Seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas G. Mitchell, late of Company B, Forty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Miers B. Betts, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob Snook, late of Company E, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John T. Plummer, late of Company I, Third Regiment Potomac Home Brigade, Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Felix Karl, late of Company E, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Columbus Jeffries, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin F. Sweet, late of Company E, One hundred and fifty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Carrie S. Wright, helpless and dependent child of William H. Wright, late of Company B, One hundred and ninety-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William H. Harris, late of Company B, One hundred and thirty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles G. Craig, late of Company H, Third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Luman W. Storey, late of Company H, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Myronus Lomis, late of Company I, One hundred and second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Griffith, late of Company K, Third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Storer Packer, late of Company E, Fifty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles E. Speer, late of Company F, One hundred and seventieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin Vanfossen, late of Company B, One hundred and twenty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Watson, widow of Lindley Watson, late of the Sixth Battery, Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$37 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Della M. Watson, helpless and dependent child of said Lindley Watson, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary J. Watson, the name of said Della M. Watson shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Mary J. Watson.

The name of Emanuel Mayberry, late of Company K, Eighteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cullen Bradley, late of the Sixth Independent Battery, Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Maloy, late of Company E, Twenty-ninth and Twentieth Regiments Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Carroll, late of Company C, Thirty-fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frederick J. Cressey, late of Company G, Fourteenth Regiment United States Colored Infantry, and Company B, Seventeenth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph M. Johnston, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Adaline Swearingen, former widow of Samuel P. Young, late of Company H, One hundred and seventy-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Albert Pride, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George E. Sabin, late of Company F, Fifty-seventh Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, Nineteenth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Young, late of Company C, Eighteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Sargent, late of Company H, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isalah Blair, late of Company B, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Adam G. Fitzkee, late of Company B, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment, and Company F, One hundred and ninety-fifth Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peter T. Nile, alias Patrick Nilan, late of Company H, Twenty-third Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Akerman, late of Company I, Forty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Luke Arnold, late of Company F, Ninety-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William C. Adams, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Patrick Kellagher, late of Company G, First Regiment, and Company E, Twenty-first Regiment, Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac B. Robinson, late of Company H, One hundred and thirty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James N. Russell, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob C. Maddix, late of Company I, Forty-fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rufus Potter, late of Company I, Two hundred and eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Phillips, late of Company G, One hundred and tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frederick N. Dickey, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Patrick Donoghue, late of Companies E and C, Twenty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Fred Babcock, late of Company A, Fourteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James K. P. Weaver, late of Company E, Ninety-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George C. Elliott, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Cooper, late of Company D, Sixty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Levi S. Fitchbaugh, late of Company K, Two hundred and thirtieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Laura E. Cass, former widow of John E. Cass, late of Company E, One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of George C. Hornby, late of Company K, Fifty-seventh Regiment, and Company G, One hundred and fifty-first Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William E. Openshaw, late of Battery F, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nellie Collier, former widow of Wesley W. Lair, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Johnson Schenck, late of Companies G and I, Eighty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Aaron Hart, late of Company K, Second Regiment Colorado Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Coppins, late of Company G, Forty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas E. Winfield, late of Company C, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Oscar Bowen, late of Companies K and E, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles A. Sugg, late of Company K, Eighty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Marion S. Day, late of Company F, Eighty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cyrus M. Brown, late of Company A, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John E. Spilman, late of Company G, Seventeenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph C. Whittington, late of Smith's independent company Maryland Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Frances Watches, the widow of Allen Watches, late of Company C, One hundred and forty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of John T. Bell, late of Company F, Fortieth Regiment, and Company C, Fifty-fifth Regiment, Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry B. Tonnemacher, late of Company D, Fiftieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward Smith, late of the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William N. Bridges, helpless and dependent child of Joseph Bridges, late of Company F, Thirty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Elijah Eddington, late of Company C, Forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Pleasant Evans, late of Company D, Twenty-eighth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jehu P. Kinnan, late of Company F, Tenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Mallett, late of Company G, Eightieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John F. Whipple, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Davis, late of Company D, Sixteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Perry S. Latham, late of Company D, Seventeenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James N. Dennis, late of Company H, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Horatio S. Howe, late of Company E, Seventy-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Brown, late of Company L, Twenty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George F. Bennett, late of Company B, One hundred and thirty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Ranft, late of Company G, Fourteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary F. Russell, widow of Alfred W. Russell, late of Company F, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Engineers and Mechanics, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of John A. Barr, late of Company A, Thirty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis Feltner, late of Company L, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alexander G. Duff, late of Company L, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anthony Lafor, late of Company M, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis Penny, late of Companies G and B, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Veteran Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jeremiah Daniels, late of Company H, One hundred and thirty-ninth Regiment, and Company C, Sixty-fourth Regiment Ohio

Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Vinel E. McCreary, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Helon C. Norton, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, Twenty-third Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jonathan Miller, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Croft, late of Company C, Third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry J. Fruchey, late of Company I, Ninety-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles M. Merrill, late of Company B, Fourteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abbie H. Lewis, widow of Henry A. Lewis, late of Company B, One hundred and twenty-fourth Illinois Infantry, and Company E, Sixty-fourth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of David K. W. Briggs, late of Company D, Second Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Cook, the former widow of Homer C. Cook, late of Company I, First Regiment Missouri Engineers of the West, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of John Getz, late of Company B, Two hundred and fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Randolph Snell, late of Company F, First Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Geuder, late of the band, Twelfth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William A. Pine, late of Company D, Thirty-third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edgar C. Martin, late of Company K, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward F. Gurry, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Clara E. Larish, helpless and dependent child of Andrew S. Larish, late of Company A, Ninetieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of August Dorman, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert Stevenson, late of Company F, Sixty-ninth Regiment New York State Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cyrus Boone, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Strassner, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Strobe, late of Company C, Twentieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph H. Woolen, late of Company F, Eighty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James S. Taylor, late of Company I, One hundred and thirty-ninth and One hundred and forty-sixth Regiments Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hezekiah W. Kelley, late of Company F, Thirty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John P. Hardin, late of Company H, Fifth and Sixth Regiments West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Felton, late of Company I, Ninety-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert Fields, late of Companies D and K, Ninth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elisha S. Peck, late of Company K, Twenty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John S. Brademeyer, late of Company M, Tenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ida I. Goldman, helpless and dependent child of William H. Goldman, late of Company H, Twenty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Levi Blume, late of Company D, First Regiment Mississippi Marine Brigade Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank M. Gibson, late of Company F, Sixty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George A. C. Coffey, late of Company K, Nineteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eli Sherman, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Hood, late of Company K, Tenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James McKittrick, late of Company G, Ninetieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William A. Burns, late of Company E, Eighty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Reed, late of Company I, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Haxton, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edwin Downs, late of Company E, Nineteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry (Heavy Artillery), and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isalah Hilliard, late of Company A, Eighty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Cornell, late of the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ann Diltz, widow of William H. Diltz, late of Company —, One hundred and ninety-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Charles S. Phelps, late of Company F, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Bu-rell, late of Company K, Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John P. Hodgkins, late of the Second Independent Battery Massachusetts Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Allen McKee, late of Company I, Third and Fifth Regiments Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Brossart, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry C. Salton, late of Company A, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Bernard, widow of Ferdinand E. Bernard, late of Company I, Nineteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Hugh Stevenson, late of Company C, Ninety-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin P. Baldwin, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Calvin A. Hutchinson, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and Company K, Eighteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ross Montgomery, late of Company C, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Kint, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Christian A. Baldwin, late of Company H, Thirty-eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ezra H. Keniston, late of Company B, Sixteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and Company G, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel G. Blaisdell, late of Company I, Third Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Herman Brumley, late of Company I, Ninety-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel A. Parish, late of Company G, Ninth Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Hummer, late of Company H, Sixteenth Regiment, and Company I, One hundred and fourteenth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anna Hardy, widow of Thomas L. Hardy, late of Company I, One hundred and second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Daniel Ashbaugh, late of Company B, Eightieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harriet J. Houghtaling, widow of Aaron Houghtaling, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Warrington O. Smith, late of Company C, Twenty-sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Erskine M. Hamilton, late of Company H, One hundred and ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William C. Rumsell, late of Company D, Ninety-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Fitzgerald, late of Company D, Fifty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Morgan W. Mills, late of Company L, Ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles M. Kell, late of Company C, First Regiment Mountaineers' California Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martin L. Rex, late of Company I, Twenty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and Third Regiment Pennsylvania Provisional Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Amos M. Stroh, late of Company D, Two hundred and eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Esther Penick, widow of Daniel Penick, late of Company G, One hundred and nineteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of John Foster, late of Company A, Twenty-first Regiment, and Company G, Sixtieth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry C. McMullen, late of Company G, Seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nicholas Easton, late of Companies B and A, Fiftieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert T. Bland, helpless and dependent child of James N. Bland, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John Tolliver, late of Company D, Fortieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James E. Webb, late of Companies K and B, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Carmine, late of Company I, One hundred and seventy-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David W. Anderson, late of Company D, One hundredth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

This bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

H. R. 447. Barbara F. Hicks.	H. R. 2453. Nelson G. Mills.
H. R. 473. David W. Anderson.	H. R. 2460. Zedekiah Stapleton.
H. R. 474. George W. Evans.	H. R. 2486. Timothy Kelley.
H. R. 516. Isaac B. Hawke.	H. R. 2511. Edward Van Kleeck.
H. R. 559. Adam Wilson.	H. R. 2641. John Devine.
H. R. 560. William H. Kidd.	H. R. 2644. Theodore Wilkins.
H. R. 584. Armilda Hays.	H. R. 2670. Charles A. Tucker.
H. R. 682. George Barber.	H. R. 2672. Joseph L. Killgore.
H. R. 684. John M. Sherman.	H. R. 2684. Morris Lincoln.
H. R. 730. Kate Hafer.	H. R. 2722. James B. Taylor.
H. R. 731. Joel S. Stump.	H. R. 2726. Hugh S. Stanley.
H. R. 761. Louis Auguste Zurcher.	H. R. 2729. Charles W. A. Reynolds.
H. R. 793. Patrick McDonnell.	H. R. 2864. Amos Hales.
H. R. 826. Norris C. Richmond.	H. R. 2939. George L. Wells.
H. R. 856. Isaac D. Nichols.	H. R. 2960. James Hennessy.
H. R. 858. John W. Wymore.	H. R. 2987. Otto Schellhorn, alias August Roessler.
H. R. 859. John Sanders.	H. R. 2997. James Layne.
H. R. 896. Samuel H. Smith.	H. R. 3068. George L. Clapp.
H. R. 923. William H. Brenner.	H. R. 3093. Cyrus S. Lyon.
H. R. 924. Susanna Rose.	H. R. 3159. Columbus Massey.
H. R. 934. Frederick Schwartz.	H. R. 3184. John W. La Rue.
H. R. 938. James M. Birdwell.	H. R. 3242. Hiram Marshall.
H. R. 939. Thomas C. King.	H. R. 3279. John M. Stanley.
H. R. 968. Alvin U. Persing.	H. R. 3318. Charles T. Higgins.
H. R. 973. George Brumbaugh.	H. R. 3398. Hattie Kinkadee.
H. R. 1005. Christopher Hummel.	H. R. 3454. Noah W. Gerrish.
H. R. 1010. William C. McKelvy.	H. R. 3512. Albert Booker.
H. R. 1033. John T. Bridges.	H. R. 3530. Charles W. Bennett.
H. R. 1034. Jonathan B. Rhodes.	H. R. 3684. James S. Knighton.
H. R. 1055. John McDonald.	H. R. 3736. Hiram Eells.
H. R. 1106. Sampson Sherwood.	H. R. 3745. Perry Powers.
H. R. 1132. Henry N. Yocum.	H. R. 3747. De Forest Rutman.
H. R. 1158. Peyton Johnson.	H. R. 3765. Lewis J. McHaney.
H. R. 1176. Andrew P. Grubaugh.	H. R. 3794. Bethuel J. Goff.
H. R. 1177. John Ervin.	H. R. 3798. Joseph B. Rickart.
H. R. 1186. John Q. Goss.	H. R. 3848. Hiram Hineine.
H. R. 1232. John S. Bell.	H. R. 3850. Absalom Shaeffer.
H. R. 1311. John J. West.	H. R. 3863. Robert P. Williams.
H. R. 1340. John W. Vandine.	H. R. 3865. Thomas J. Hughes.
H. R. 1389. Henry C. Chaney.	H. R. 3868. Alexander H. Reed.
H. R. 1437. Randall M. Bates.	H. R. 3898. Henry Arnold.
H. R. 1474. Bird C. Guffey.	H. R. 3923. Henry A. Adcock.
H. R. 1476. William B. Rogers.	H. R. 3947. William W. Porter.
H. R. 1477. Oberon Payne.	H. R. 3999. Elizabeth Mathews.
H. R. 1479. Archibald W. Mayden.	H. R. 4018. Samuel Shoup.
H. R. 1514. Luther W. Holmes.	H. R. 4129. John Waterhouse.
H. R. 1521. Eva L. Phillips.	H. R. 4186. Nathaniel C. Long.
H. R. 1538. Simeon Flory.	H. R. 4206. Thomas J. Trulock.
H. R. 1539. James Riley.	H. R. 4252. Melvin Seward.
H. R. 1555. Josiah W. Lamb.	H. R. 4273. Loveman Place.
H. R. 1586. Nathaniel H. Guthery.	H. R. 4274. Joseph H. Pillars.
H. R. 1592. Benjamin B. Cravens.	H. R. 4276. George Hedrick.
H. R. 1640. Benjamin M. Curtis.	H. R. 4278. Uriah J. Favorite.
H. R. 1643. James W. Stine.	H. R. 4288. William C. Lawrence.
H. R. 1644. Richard H. Hughes.	H. R. 4289. Christian Weisel.
H. R. 1828. Stephen Mullen.	H. R. 4290. Thomas J. Westfall.
H. R. 1849. Charles W. Smith, alias James D. Miner.	H. R. 4292. Jacob Bachman.
H. R. 1920. Frank P. Lawrence.	H. R. 4311. John R. Rice.
H. R. 1936. William J. Shwimmer.	H. R. 4340. Thomas G. Mitchell.
H. R. 2149. Luther Martin.	H. R. 4387. Miers B. Betts.
H. R. 2203. Edward M. Jurin.	H. R. 4396. Jacob Snook.
H. R. 2222. Andrew J. Buchanan.	H. R. 4399. John T. Plummer.
H. R. 2225. Upton J. Hammond.	H. R. 4420. Felix Karl.
H. R. 2249. Henry Eby.	H. R. 4435. Columbus Jeffries.
H. R. 2256. Rufus G. Cook.	H. R. 4542. Benjamin F. Sweet.
H. R. 2258. John W. Craig.	H. R. 4550. Carrie S. Wright.
H. R. 2270. Enos Pearce.	H. R. 4631. William H. Harris.
H. R. 2271. Wiltsey E. Sivers.	H. R. 4671. Charles G. Craig.
H. R. 2278. John Pool.	H. R. 4673. Luman W. Storey.
H. R. 2366. Charles W. Webster.	H. R. 4678. Myrenus Loomis.
H. R. 2395. David McQuinney.	H. R. 4694. William Griffith.
H. R. 2404. William Mooneyham.	H. R. 4787. Storer Packer.
H. R. 2417. James Skrine.	H. R. 4793. Charles E. Speer.
H. R. 2434. John Routine.	H. R. 4794. Benjamin Vanfosson.
H. R. 2441. Elijah Walters.	H. R. 4796. Mary J. Watson.
H. R. 2452. George W. Horton.	H. R. 4836. Emanuel Mayberry.

H. R. 4905. Cullen Bradley.
 H. R. 4921. Daniel Maloy.
 H. R. 4946. William H. Carroll.
 H. R. 4974. Frederick J. Cressey.
 H. R. 5039. Joseph M. Johnston.
 H. R. 5064. Adaline Swearingen.
 H. R. 5085. Albert Swide.
 H. R. 5087. George F. Sablin.
 H. R. 5096. George Young.
 H. R. 5145. George W. Sargent.
 H. R. 5230. Isalah Blair.
 H. R. 5278. Adam G. Fitzkee.
 H. R. 5297. Peter T. Niles, alias Patrick Nilan.
 H. R. 5316. John Akerman.
 H. R. 5322. Luke Arnold.
 H. R. 5373. William C. Adams.
 H. R. 5375. Patrick Kelligher.
 H. R. 5399. Isaac B. Robinson.
 H. R. 5402. James N. Russell.
 H. R. 5420. Jacob C. Maddix.
 H. R. 5506. Rufus Potter.
 H. R. 5581. Thomas Phillips.
 H. R. 5663. Frederick N. Dickey.
 H. R. 5664. Patrick Donoghue.
 H. R. 5780. Fred Babcock.
 H. R. 5801. James K. P. Weaver.
 H. R. 5834. George C. Elliott.
 H. R. 5837. Samuel Cooper.
 H. R. 5904. Levi S. Finchbaugh.
 H. R. 5914. Laura E. Cass.
 H. R. 5923. George C. Hornby.
 H. R. 5937. William E. Openshaw.
 H. R. 5942. Nellie Collier.
 H. R. 5982. Johnson Schenck.
 H. R. 5991. Aaron Hart.
 H. R. 6018. George Coppins.
 H. R. 6036. Thomas E. Winfield.
 H. R. 6037. Oscar Bowen.
 H. R. 6092. Charles A. Sugg.
 H. R. 6145. Marion S. Pay.
 H. R. 6247. Cyrus M. Brown.
 H. R. 6260. John E. Spilman.
 H. R. 6317. Joseph C. Whittington.
 H. R. 6323. Frances Watches.
 H. R. 6366. John T. Bell.
 H. R. 6375. Henry B. Tonnemacher.
 H. R. 6407. Edward Smith.
 H. R. 6427. William N. Bridges.
 H. R. 6428. Elijah Eddington.
 H. R. 6429. Pleasant Evans.
 H. R. 6431. Jehu P. Kinman.
 H. R. 6434. John Mallett.
 H. R. 6441. John F. Whipple.
 H. R. 6461. Daniel Davis.
 H. R. 6478. Perry S. Latham.
 H. R. 6496. James N. Dennis.
 H. R. 6700. Horatio S. Howe.
 H. R. 6703. Henry Brown.
 H. R. 6704. George F. Bennett.
 H. R. 6708. Joseph Ranft.
 H. R. 6723. Mary F. Russell.
 H. R. 6732. John A. Barr.
 H. R. 6742. Lewis Feltner.
 H. R. 6743. Alexander G. Duff.
 H. R. 6815. Anthony Lafor.
 H. R. 6816. Francis Penny.
 H. R. 6817. Jeremiah Daniels.
 H. R. 6819. Vinel E. McCrary.
 H. R. 6852. Helon C. Norton.
 H. R. 6853. Jonathan Miller.
 H. R. 6854. Thomas Croft.
 H. R. 6855. Henry J. Fruchey.
 H. R. 6857. Charles M. Merrill.
 H. R. 6858. Abbie H. Lewis.
 H. R. 6862. David K. V. Briggs.
 H. R. 6869. Mary J. Cook.
 H. R. 6912. John Getz.
 H. R. 6928. Randolph Snell.
 H. R. 6987. John Geuder.
 H. R. 6989. William A. Pine.
 H. R. 6990. Edgar C. Martin.
 H. R. 7051. Edward F. Gurry.
 H. R. 7068. Clara E. Larish.
 H. R. 7090. August Dorman.
 H. R. 7115. Robert Stevenson.
 H. R. 7125. Cyrus Boone.
 H. R. 7243. Henry Strassner.
 H. R. 7246. William Strope.
 H. R. 7250. Joseph H. Woollen.
 H. R. 7261. James S. Taylor.
 H. R. 7262. Hezekiah W. Kelley.
 H. R. 7275. John P. Hardin.
 H. R. 7307. Daniel Felton.
 H. R. 7393. Albert Fields.
 H. R. 7398. Ellisha S. Peck.
 H. R. 7406. John S. Brademeyer.
 H. R. 7407. Ida I. Goldman.
 H. R. 7410. Levi Blume.
 H. R. 7428. Frank M. Gibson.
 H. R. 7461. George A. C. Coffey.
 H. R. 7471. Eli Sherman.
 H. R. 7473. David Hood.
 H. R. 7477. James McKittrick.
 H. R. 7479. William A. Burns.
 H. R. 7480. John W. Reed.
 H. R. 7481. Thomas Haxton.
 H. R. 7510. Edwin Downs.
 H. R. 7517. Isalah Hillard.
 H. R. 7523. John Cornell.
 H. R. 7554. Ann Diltz.
 H. R. 7581. Charles S. Phelps.
 H. R. 7591. John Burrell.
 H. R. 7603. John P. Hodgkins.
 H. R. 7604. Allen McKee.
 H. R. 7615. Charles Brossart.
 H. R. 7667. Henry C. Salton.
 H. R. 7677. Mary J. Bernard.
 H. R. 7710. Hugh Stevenson.
 H. R. 7711. Benjamin P. Baldwin.
 H. R. 7745. Calvin A. Hutchinson.
 H. R. 7753. Ross Montgomery.
 H. R. 7759. George Kint.
 H. R. 7765. Christian A. Baldwin.
 H. R. 7809. Ezra H. Keniston.
 H. R. 7810. Daniel G. Blaisdell.
 H. R. 7838. Herman Brumley.
 H. R. 7839. Samuel A. Parish.
 H. R. 7846. William Hummer.
 H. R. 7848. Anna Hardy.
 H. R. 7852. Daniel Ashbaugh.
 H. R. 7865. Harriet J. Houghtaling.
 H. R. 7876. Warrington O. Smith.
 H. R. 7899. Erskine M. Hamilton.
 H. R. 7905. William C. Rumsell.
 H. R. 7968. George W. Fitzgald.
 H. R. 8022. Morgan W. Mills.
 H. R. 8042. Charles M. Kell.
 H. R. 8056. Martin L. Rex.
 H. R. 8058. Amos M. Stroh.
 H. R. 8065. Esther Penick.
 H. R. 8128. John Foster.
 H. R. 8157. Henry C. McMullen.
 H. R. 8158. Nicholas Easton.
 H. R. 8159. Robert T. Bland.
 H. R. 8164. John Tolliver.
 H. R. 8189. James W. Webb.
 H. R. 8295. James Carmine.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia). The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 1, after the word "of," strike out "\$30" and insert "\$50."

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, the report of the committee on this case shows that the soldier, a veteran of the Civil War, is 73 years of age and has no property or income of any kind, except the pension which he is now receiving. The medical testimony filed with the committee shows that he is "wholly unfitted for manual labor, by reason of asthma, chronic myocarditis, interstitial nephritis, and arteriosclerosis."

I think it will be conceded by everyone that a soldier who is afflicted as the report shows this soldier to be, and who has no property or income, ought to receive more pension than \$30 per month. He is now receiving \$20 per month, and the committee recommends that he be given \$30. He is unable to work and has no property or income of any kind. He certainly can not live on this amount, especially if he has a wife or family dependent upon him for support. Fifty dollars now will not go as far as \$30 would a few years ago.

I realize, however, the practical impossibility of getting an item in one of these omnibus pension bills increased on the floor of the House after it has been reported by the committee, and I do not wish anyone to construe what I have to say as in any way being a criticism of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, which reports this bill. I appreciate the fact, as every-

one else here does, that that committee does good, conscientious work and a lot of it; and I take this opportunity to urge upon the committee to report a bill giving an increase of pension to all the veterans of the Civil War. I believe such a bill would pass the House by an overwhelming majority if the committee would only give us a chance to vote upon it.

There have been several bills introduced in this Congress which are now before the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to increase the pensions now being paid to the veterans of the Civil War. Some of them would keep the principle of the age-and-service law but raise the rates as provided therein; others would give all veterans of the Civil War a pension of \$50. I believe the committee should promptly report one of these bills.

It is fair to say that practically all of the men who fought in the Civil War are now over 70 years of age and unable to perform manual labor to support themselves. The time has come when the committee, however diligent, can not differentiate between the degrees of helplessness which exist in these old men. They are all helpless; they are all worthy.

The last session of Congress very justly raised the pensions paid to widows of veterans of the Civil War from \$12 and \$20 to \$25 per month. Let us before this session adjourns do complete justice and raise the pensions of the men who actually did the fighting from what they are now receiving to \$50 per month or some amount that is just and adequate. [Applause.]

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, this is one of 301 cases in this bill. If we undertake to thrash out an amendment to all of these items we will not get anywhere with this legislation. The committee has considered all of these items as best they could in the time they have had to do it. They have tried to do exact justice, and in this case believe it is no exception. The soldier mentioned in this item for whom the increase is asked had a comparatively short service, one year and three months. It is true that he is 70 years of age, but many others in this bill are 80 and 85 years of age. Many cases, it is shown by proof, require the attention of nurses all the time to take care of them, and had a long service in the war. The rules of the committee permit the allowance of \$50 in such cases, but they limit special bills to \$50. If we allow the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, when there is no proof of needed assistance, it would not be fair to those who have served longer, who are more helpless, who are older, and who need the assistance of an attendant all the time. So there would be a disparity and a partiality shown unless you increase all others. I hope the House will not encourage an amendment of this sort. We invite Members of the House who have bills to come before the committee. We try to treat everybody fairly and do not discriminate against anyone if we know it, and did not do so in this case. If I am correctly informed and understand the facts of the case, the soldier referred to in this amendment lives in Missouri and not in Michigan. He is not a resident of the district represented by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] but is in the district represented by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER], who is satisfied with the amount which is allowed. He is asking for no amendment, and it will be manifestly improper for the House to vote an amendment for this man in view of all the proof, in view of all the facts, and in view of the fact that the author is satisfied with the action and recommendation of the committee. I ask all of those who are interested in getting liberal pensions for the old soldiers who need them to stand by this committee as the proper way to get the best and the most adequate relief. I hope the House will vote down this amendment.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the pending amendment proposes to increase the pension of one of the proposed beneficiaries in this bill from \$30 per month, as reported by the committee, to \$50 per month. The soldier is now pensioned at the rate of \$20 per month. The committee recommends that his pension be increased to \$30. He is shown to be unable to perform manual labor and to own no property and to be entirely without any other income or means of support except his pension. He is not helpless and does not require the aid or assistance of another person in caring for himself. Under the rules of the Committee on Invalid Pensions \$30 per month is the limit of allowance in cases of this kind. Personally I would be in favor of allowing a greater rate, but it would be unfair to do so in this case unless, at the same time, we grant similar increases in all other cases. If the House thinks we should be more liberal and go beyond the rate prescribed by the rules, the committee would like to be advised of that fact. We have a very large number of such cases as this before the committee, and we try to treat all alike, and we think no case should be singled out for an increase above the rates allowed by the committee under the rules, unless it is the desire of the Members of the House that all Civil War pensions should be

increased. I have myself introduced a bill providing for an increase of pensions by general law, in cases like this, to \$50 per month, and I would like to see that bill, or some general bill, enacted at this session of Congress to increase all pensions of Civil War veterans who are now receiving or entitled to pensions of less than \$50 per month. I am not particular whether it is my bill or some other bill, but I would like to see a general increase all along the line. The same arguments now being made for increase of pay to Government employees apply equally to the matter of the pensions of the old soldiers. The country owes them much. They saved this Union. We can afford to treat them justly and generously. As everyone knows, the cost of living and of all the necessities of life have increased enormously in the last few years. In the case of an old soldier who is destitute, who owns no property, and has no income aside from his pension, \$30 per month is wholly inadequate for his support, and where he has a wife or children dependent upon him for support the amount is ridiculously inadequate. I think that by a general bill we should grant pensions of \$50 per month in all such cases, thus doing away with the necessity of passing so many special pension bills. Thousands of cases which the committee never hears of are as deserving as any of those reported by the committee, and relief should be granted in all such cases.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. I will.

Mr. DOWELL. Would not the gentleman favor an amendment of the rule until his bill is passed upon by Congress in order to allow deserving men a larger pension than the rule admits?

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. I would be in favor of allowing a larger amount in all cases where the pensioner is without means of support other than his pension and is virtually in a helpless condition.

Mr. DOWELL. Would not the gentleman be in favor of the committee amending the rule under the circumstances?

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. I would like to know how the House feels on that.

Mr. DOWELL. It is a committee rule and not a rule of the House. Why can not the committee amend it?

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. I am in favor of a larger amount, but I am in the minority on that committee.

The example set by these old veterans of the Civil War is worth untold millions in the present emergency. Their devotion to duty, their patriotism, their deeds of valor on many a hard-fought battle field form many of the brightest pages in the history of this free Government and are an inspiration to the patriotic young men of this generation who are to-day fighting for the liberation of mankind from the yoke of tyranny, autocracy, and frightfulness. As the Government cares for its old soldiers, their widows and orphans, so may the young patriots of to-day know that they and their loved ones will be cared for in the coming days when the present great conflict is over and when the shadows lengthen in their declining years. We are appropriating vast sums to carry on the war in which we are now engaged, and we have pledged, if necessary, all the resources of this great Nation, and we shall make good. We shall win the war at whatever cost, that the lives and liberties of those who are to come after us may be safeguarded on land and sea, safe from attacks by an outlaw nation or a murderous military autocracy led by ambitious scoundrels who recognize no law of humanity, of justice, or of right.

But while the present and the future problems demand our undivided attention, let us not forget to do justice to those who carried our flag to victory, who made our country great and free, whose fighting days are over, but whose example will spur on to victory our national armies now engaged or about to engage in the most titanic struggle in all the world's history. A few more years and the last veteran of that grand Army of the Union will have passed away. Any aid we can give them in the few remaining years they are to be with us should be given promptly, cheerfully, and as matter of justice and right. Compared with other appropriations we are making the cost will not be great, and in this case, if in no other, there should be no cheeseparing. In these days of the Nation's supreme trial let it be known as the settled policy of the Government that the Nation's defenders shall ever be held in sacred remembrance, and that they and their dependents shall always be entitled to and shall receive the first consideration of the Government which they risked their lives to save and perpetuate.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I formerly served on the Committee on Invalid Pensions under Gen. SHERWOOD, with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL], and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY], and I learned certain things there. One of them is that you are bound in that committee by

certain rules of action. Necessarily so, and the provision in the item under consideration is in accordance with those rules. I also learned then what I am sure is the case now, that members of that committee are disposed to do everything possible for the old soldiers and the widows.

I am, therefore, not speaking from the standpoint of criticism of the work of the committee, but rather by reason of the expression of the gentleman from Illinois, Judge FULLER, asking for something in respect to the sentiment of the House. I do not think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] offered this amendment with a view to this item alone, but rather as a precedent, which would be followed in other items in the bill, and in view of such action by the House then the committee would probably make some change in their rules and perhaps give the greater consideration to more generous general legislation, since the committee, I am sure, does desire to know and to do what the House desires.

Since we have provided that the widows are to receive \$25 a month as a pension, it is not consistent that a veteran of the Civil War who served a year and four months should receive only \$20, when that man may have not only himself to support, as would be the case of a widow, but a wife to support.

Further, I know that the principle that moves the Committee on Invalid Pensions and this House is that they do not desire that in their old age the veterans who rendered good service in the crisis of a half century ago, or their widows after they are gone, shall starve or go to the poorhouse or be the objects of private charity, but that they will get sufficient pension to keep them out of the poorhouse. Two or three years ago \$30 would do that, but if that old veteran has a wife living with him, how can they live on \$30 a month in these times?

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. What does the gentleman say about this situation? We all understand, of course, that we can not get a special bill through the Senate that provides for a higher rate than \$50 a month. If you raise a case like this to \$50, where an attendant is not needed, as the evidence discloses, would that be just to that class of cases where the soldier is shown to be helpless and to require the constant aid and attendance of another person? The gentleman seems to be inclined himself to the proposition of general pension legislation raising the rate, and with that I am in hearty accord, but I do not think his position is consistent on this case.

Mr. CRAMTON. The most we have in mind—and I think that is all my colleague from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] has in mind, is to give to the Committee on Invalid Pensions an idea of the sentiment of the House—

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes; that is what I want to know, and I am glad to note these evidences of a liberal sentiment toward the old soldiers. I have a bill proposing a much higher rate for all of them.

Mr. CRAMTON (continuing). That the committee may realize that we have need for legislation, and that it will report legislation such as the House wants.

Mr. LANGLEY. Exactly.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. If we should give the soldier affected by this amendment \$50 under the proof filed before the committee, does the gentleman from Michigan believe that that will be sufficient, then, for those who served three or four times as long and are a great deal older and more helpless and need a nurse all of the time?

Mr. CRAMTON. So far as keeping out of the poorhouse is concerned, I am just as anxious to keep out of the poorhouse the man who served a year and four months as the man who served three or four years. It is not a question now based on age and service, although I think that age and service act ought to have considerable amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not the gentleman appreciate that a man who is bedfast or who is totally blind ought to have more money than a man who is not bedfast or who is not totally blind or who does not need any nurse?

Mr. CRAMTON. If the man gave good service and is now without property, without other income than his pension, I would favor this Congress giving him, whether he be bedfast or not, a sufficient pension to enable him to live and support his wife, if he has one, without taking private charity. If the committee finds that \$50 will not do that in the case of a man who is bedfast, then it should make it more than \$50.

Mr. RUSSELL. What limit would the gentleman recommend?

Mr. CRAMTON. Sufficient to keep them out of the poorhouse and from the necessity for receiving private charity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, as a member of this committee I would like to express my views on the point raised by the gentleman who desires to amend the report. The gentleman's statement that he is willing to give \$50 to any man who served, regardless of the length of service, if he is unable to support himself, meets a responsive chord in my heart. I am in entire harmony with that statement. I do not think that \$50, the limit that we are allowed to give by the rule of the committee, is sufficient in the case of total disability, where a nurse is required. Neither do I think that \$30 is enough for anyone who is totally incapable of performing manual labor. I do not think \$30 is enough for the support of a soldier who has reached the age most Civil War Veterans have attained, regardless of the length of service; but those are the rules as established by the committee. If we take out a single exception, it means that it will be in each instance criticized and corrected by this Congress and result in unequal and unfair discriminations among these old fellows, most of whom are entitled to the tenderest and most generous and impartial consideration from this Government. The real remedy would be a new general bill, general legislation covering that point.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. In a minute. I am in entire sympathy with the sentiment expressed by the gentleman who preceded me, in which he asks for more liberal pensions for soldiers of the Civil War, and I know there is a large sentiment in this Congress in favor of a bill coming out of this committee favoring a higher rate for all soldiers, so that we will not be required by special act in each instance to come before Congress and petition for enough money for the soldier to live on, and as a member of the committee I will vote to favorably report such a bill. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOWELL. Until such a bill is presented, is not the real remedy to amend the committee rule?

Mr. BLAND. I think so, absolutely, but not to amend the bill that was drawn under the rule; but what we need is a new general law.

Mr. DOWELL. It seems to me the committee should do that, and not attempt to control the House when it attempts to raise the amount.

Mr. BLAND. As has just been said, the gentleman will run up against the proposition of getting this bill, if amended as suggested, through at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. DOWELL. That is their responsibility, not ours.

Mr. BLAND. We are trying, in the most practical way, to give relief to the old soldiers as well as we can under the circumstances.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. BLAND. I will.

Mr. LANGLEY. And that is that the Committee on Invalid Pensions is going to take up at an early date the question of reporting a general measure affecting the situation we are now discussing, and, if the gentleman will pardon me further, I think that any attempt here to raise rates beyond what we know the Senate will approve will only delay this legislation, because it will involve amendments and thrashing it out in conference later on.

Mr. BLAND. The question raised here by the gentleman's proposed amendment merely emphasizes the fact that there is universal demand for a pension law for the Civil War soldiers, and for all other soldiers of other wars, for that matter, that is reasonable in amount but sufficient to take care of the needs of those men who are suffering. I think this debate emphasizes this fact, and I know that there are certain bills which have been presented, one by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VESTAL], which is before this committee now, and other bills of a similar character, by which they are seeking to raise the general rate for the old soldier. I am heartily in sympathy with such effort, but at present, when gentlemen ask you to override the rules of this committee and show partiality in favor of some, I say it will result in giving some a higher rate than others who are equally deserving. Take, for instance, my grandfather's captain, whose pension is increased in this bill; he is 85 years of age. He is totally helpless; he has to have an attendant; and \$50, the limit under the rules, is not enough. Another soldier, a constituent from my district, is in here who is absolutely in need, in want, who, under this bill, gets only \$30 a month. I insisted that they get the limit of their class under the rules, but I have no quarrel with my committee because they have treated these constituents the same as others in their class. Until the House shall express by vote its wishes, or require a voting out of this committee, a general law to aid the old soldiers you can not get much relief. It only causes a fight at the other end of this Capitol if you exceed the rules of our committee.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Speaker, as the debate has taken a general character, I wish to say a few words at this time. I will gladly vote for the pending bill, but it seems to me that the time is at hand when on account of the necessitous circumstances of something like 300,000 Civil War veterans now on the pension roll that there is a pressing demand on this Congress to pass, and speedily pass, a general law that will increase the rates of pension of such soldiers drawing \$55 and less per month. I am not wedded to any particular rate. I do not know that I am wedded to the particular line of demarcation that I have mapped out, but in the closing days of the last session this House, by a large vote, and the Senate passed a law increasing the pension of the Civil War widows, giving them from \$12 to \$25 and from \$20 to \$25 a month. Why? Because this House determined here after days and days of deliberation that it required \$25 a month to support a young widow of a soldier who was killed or died from injuries or disease contracted in the present war. If that is true, of course it follows that the mothers of the soldiers of the present war, who are widows of soldiers of former wars, should have \$25 per month. Now, what is the situation? Here is an anomalous condition. We have to-day upon the pension roll fewer than 100,000 Civil War veterans drawing more than \$25 a month. There were more than 200,000 Civil War veterans drawing less than \$25 a month July 1, 1917, as shown by the last report of the Commissioner of Pensions. The men who faced the shot and shell and endured the hardships of the conflict drawing less than \$25. One of the first men to enlist from my home county and who served four years, by a special act draws only \$24 a month to-day. I have a bundle of petitions here asking that these pensions be increased, not only from old soldiers but from other citizens of my district. One petition is signed by 73 Civil War veterans of one county, and only 2 are 69, 4 are 70, and the remaining 67 are away beyond 70 years of age, and this Congress having meted out a fair measure of justice to the Civil War widows, it should not hesitate to do what is right by these old veterans. The woman who married a Civil War soldier 30 years after the war, much younger than these soldiers here petitioning for relief to-day, when he dies draws \$25 a month, but while living as man and wife only \$24, \$20, \$17, and less in many cases is received for the support of both. This is the absurd situation in which we find ourselves, and it seems to me the Committee on Invalid Pensions—I do not want to criticize them—ought to get to work quickly and report out a bill increasing most of the present rates. I have introduced a bill, I am not particularly wedded to it, asking an increase of 40 per cent for all drawing under \$30, 33½ per cent for all those drawing \$30 and under \$40, and 20 per cent for those drawing \$40 and not over \$55, and that when a soldier reaches 76 years of age he be given no pension of less than \$40 a month and no pension shall be given less than \$30 a month. The last rate might be reduced, but no soldier who served 3, 6, 9, 12 months or 2 years ought to receive less than his widow receives on account of his death.

True, our resources are being heavily taxed and burdened with large obligations which must be defrayed in the future, but I do not believe we have reached that degree of financial depression that makes it necessary to be neglectful of the pressing needs of the survivors of that grand army which by its heroic efforts from '61 to '65 preserved the Union and made it possible to have a mighty American Republic to wage the great world battle for human liberty to-day.

Omnibus bills carrying increases for a few hundred or a few thousand cases will not suffice, and it is urgent that a general law be enacted substantially increasing the pensions of 200,000 of the 300,000 Civil War veterans now on the pension roll drawing less than \$25 per month, practically all of whom have outlived the allotted three score years and ten and who are not only handicapped by the infirmities accompanying old age but who are also pinched by the high cost of living now prevailing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Felix Karl, late of Company B, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the bill by striking out lines 7 to 10, inclusive, on page 25, his bill having been passed previously.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking a question of the chairman of the committee. Is he contemplating taking steps to have hear-

ings on or to report out any general law for increase in the rate of pensions?

Mr. RUSSELL. I will state that there have been a number of general bills offered proposing to increase pensions of soldiers and they are pending before the committee. No time has yet been fixed for the hearing on those bills, but I presume the chairman of the committee, Gen. SHERWOOD, will call a meeting for that purpose, when such bills will be properly considered. I will not undertake to state what the action of the committee will be. Personally I realize that with the present high cost of living the soldiers deserve more, especially many who are poor and helpless.

Mr. SWITZER. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask the same thing. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Robert Stevenson, late of Company F, Sixty-ninth Regiment New York State Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask to amend, on page 42, line 2, by adding after the word "Militia" the word "Infantry." As it is, it is a clerical error.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment indicated will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Edwin Downs, late of Company E, Nineteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry (Heavy Artillery), and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask to amend, on page 45, at line 18, by inserting in the bracket, before the word "Heavy," the word "Second." It is a typographical error. I want it to read "Second Heavy Artillery."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RUSSELL: Page 45, line 18, after the bracket, before the word "Heavy," insert "Second."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Ann Diltz, widow of William H. Diltz, late of Company —, One hundred and ninety-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask to amend, on page 46, at line 5, by striking out the word "Company" and the comma. It is a mistake of the Printing Office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RUSSELL: Page 46, line 5, after the word "of," strike out the word "Company" and the comma.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of John P. Hodgkins, late of the Second Independent Battery Massachusetts Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask to amend, on page 46, line 18, by striking out the figures "30" and inserting "36." This is not an increase to be made on the floor, but is a typographical error which ought to be corrected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, line 18, after the word "of," strike out the numerals "30" and insert in lieu thereof "36."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of William Hummer, late of Company II, Sixteenth Regiment, and Company I, One hundred and fourteenth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask to amend the bill on page 49, at the end of line 3, by striking out the two character letters and inserting the letter "H" instead. As it is now, it is a roman two.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RUSSELL: Page 49, line 3, strike out "II" and insert in lieu thereof the letter "H."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the amended bill.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. RUSSELL, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

WATER-POWER COMMITTEE.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I offer by direction of the Committee on Rules a privileged report, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LONDON. By special order I have been given leave to address the House after the disposition of the omnibus pension bill, which has just been disposed of. Does that order stand after this rule is disposed of, or do I waive my right?

The SPEAKER. Yes; it stands. This is the way of it: Whether the Chair put it that way or not, it is the way it ought to be put always as to these special orders, namely, not to interfere with privileged matters. That order was made, and the Chair will recognize the gentleman as soon as we can get through with this.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 220 (H. Rept. No. 238).

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to appoint a special committee of 18 members to whom all bills and resolutions hereafter introduced during the Sixty-fifth Congress pertaining to the development or utilization of water power shall be referred (notwithstanding any general rule of the House to the contrary), except, however, bills and resolutions of which the Committee on Foreign Affairs has jurisdiction under the general rules of the House.

Resolved further, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be, and it is hereby, discharged from further consideration of H. R. 3808, H. R. 7695, H. R. 4504, H. R. 8005, and S. 1419, and said bills are hereby referred to the special committee herein provided for; that the Committee on Public Lands is discharged from further consideration of H. R. 7227, and the same is hereby referred to the special committee aforesaid.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I shall submit a very few observations concerning the resolution now under consideration, and I shall be glad then to yield to other gentlemen who know more about the history of this matter than I do.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POU. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. Does the gentleman intend to yield some time to our side?

Mr. POU. I do. I mean that there is no purpose on my part to attempt to cut off reasonable debate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Can we have an agreement to that effect?

Mr. POU. I believe under the rules I am entitled to an hour, and I will yield from that hour as fairly as I can.

Mr. LENROOT. You will yield to this side?

Mr. POU. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I desire to make some remarks against the resolution.

Mr. POU. I will be glad to have the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] control 30 minutes of the hour.

It is well known to the membership of this House, Mr. Speaker, that there has been controversy with respect to water-power legislation for a long time. It is extremely desirable from many standpoints that action be taken by this Congress to the end that the immense water power of this country which is now being wasted shall be made available.

The rule, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Rules, provides for the creation of a committee of 18. No limitation is placed upon the Speaker in the selection of this committee, because of that unanimous confidence which is entertained on both sides of this Chamber in the Speaker of this House. I will state that the Committee on Interstate and For-

sign Commerce, the Committee on the Public Lands, the Committee on Agriculture, and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors are entirely in harmony with the proposal to create the new committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. POU. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is it proposed to make this committee up from the four committees named?

Mr. POU. I will say to the gentleman from Washington such a suggestion has been made; but, as I said, there is no requirement in the rule as to where the membership of this committee shall be taken from.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But there is an understanding as to where they shall be taken from?

Mr. POU. There has been no understanding, because nobody has authority to enter into any agreement or understanding. I can simply say this to the gentleman that—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Did not the gentleman just say there was an understanding?

Mr. POU. No. The matter has been discussed by these respective committees, and the committees that I have named are entirely in harmony with this proposed procedure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Did not the Committee on the Public Lands meet this morning and designate five of its members to be members of that committee?

Mr. POU. I did not catch the gentleman's question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I asked if the Committee on the Public Lands met this morning and designated five of its members to be members of this new committee?

Mr. POU. I am informed that the Committee on the Public Lands did not take that action. I am informed that the Committee on the Public Lands had no meeting this morning at all, and that it has taken no action along the lines indicated by the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The whole thing seems rather nebulous. But the statement was made to me that they had agreed upon the three majority members and the two ranking members of the Committee on the Public Lands to be members of that committee.

Mr. POU. That binds nobody.

Mr. LENROOT. The Committee on the Public Lands has taken no such action.

Mr. POU. If it had, it would bind nobody.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POU. I do.

Mr. GILLET. I would not bind anybody unless there was such an understanding as would be binding and which the Speaker would be aware of. I understand there was such an understanding. There is no impropriety in it, but I think it ought to be known whether there was or not.

Mr. POU. I am going to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts this: There is no disposition to conceal anything. When this matter was before the Committee on Rules it was suggested that the new committee should be made up of gentlemen taken from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has had to do with this legislation; from the Committee on Public Lands, some gentlemen on that committee having devoted years of study to this question; and that the Committee on Agriculture should have representation on it, and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors also. That was discussed, and all that the Committee on Rules did was to provide a membership large enough so that if the Speaker of this House, after consultation, decided to take representation from those committees, he could do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. POU. I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Has it not been stated that it is proposed to make up this committee of 5 members from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and 5 members of the Committee on the Public Lands, making 10 members out of the proposed 18, and that it has been so designated on purpose, so that the members of those two committees would have control?

Mr. POU. I have heard the suggestion made that that would be a proper way to constitute the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And yet it is declared there has been no agreement or arrangement.

Mr. POU. I have heard the suggestion that, inasmuch as the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has had to do with this legislation, and inasmuch as the Committee on Public Lands is interested in it and has heretofore considered similar legislation, those committees should be more largely repre-

sented on this committee than any other committees of the House. But that is a question for the Speaker to determine when he comes to name the membership of this committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. POU. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In these discussions that the gentleman has had, of course, it is understood that those men will still retain their positions on the other committees?

Mr. POU. I can not say that there has been any such understanding. This has all been talk that binds nobody. It has been merely a suggestion as to how it would be wise and proper for the Speaker to make up this committee, having in view harmony and early action. That is all there is to it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. POU. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I ask the gentleman whether the two existing committees which will be largely distributed, whether those committees have had opportunity to give consideration to the proposed changes?

Mr. POU. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Committee on the Public Lands have considered the proposal of the creation of the new committee, and, as I said before, as I understand it, they are entirely in harmony with the proposal.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. POU. Yes.

Mr. COX. Is it designed to make this a permanent committee?

Mr. POU. No; just for the life of this Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If this committee takes hold of this nameless bill, without even a number, that provides a \$10,000 head of a commission and makes other appropriations of money, is it not likely that that committee will stay on to look after it?

Mr. COX. I do not think there is any doubt about that.

Mr. POU. So far as I am personally concerned, I will say to the gentleman that I see no reason why we should not pass a water-power bill during this Congress, and I see no reason for the continuance of this committee after the Sixty-fifth Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Why not come out in the open with the Members of this House and say that there here is a bill introduced, without even a number—

Mr. POU. It has not been introduced.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Printed as if it were a bill, though, and marked "Confidential," and that erased, a proposed water-power bill, introduced by no one, and that this bill is proposed to be reported out of this combination committee for the express purpose of blocking the bill which has been passed in another body.

Mr. POU. Oh, no.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It must be.

Mr. POU. I could not assent to that proposition at all. So far as the bill which the gentleman has there is concerned, it was printed simply for the information of the Members of the House and for the consideration of the new committee if the House should see fit to vote for the establishment of that committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. This confidential print, or whatever it is, is not available in the document room.

Mr. POU. I will state to my friend that I stated the other day on the floor of the House that the Committee on Rules had had 1,000 copies printed, and that any gentleman who desired to get a copy could either send to the office of the Committee on Rules or to the desk over there. I had a big batch of them put over there on the desk to the left of the Speaker for universal distribution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I made strenuous efforts at the document room, without success.

Mr. POU. It was not in the document room. I made that announcement the other day.

Mr. STAFFORD. I recognize that in the resolution before the House there is a departure, for the first time I believe since the Democrats obtained control of the House, in the method of appointing this special committee, a return to the old method, authorizing the appointment by the Speaker, which was so severely criticized by the Democrats and which resulted so largely in the Democrats getting control of the House. I am not here at this time to criticize the method, because in those days I believed and still believe in the appointment of the committees of the House by the Speaker with some limitations, but

as it was a cardinal principle of the Democratic faith when they gained control of the House to have the committees appointed by a committee on committees. I would like to inquire what is the reason for the departure in this instance?

Mr. POUL. In answer to the gentleman from Wisconsin I will say that there has been no departure. The rule of the House provide that all special committees shall be appointed by the Speaker. This is a special committee. We are simply following the general rules of the House. There is no change in the rule.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will yield further, while it is in a sense a special committee, every one knows that it is going to be a regular committee so far as this Congress is concerned, and that it will continue perhaps in succeeding Congresses. Under the rules of the House the Speaker has the right to appoint such special committees as committees of conference, and I am not questioning for one moment the power that should be given to the present Speaker, but you are departing from the rule which you adopted and going back to the practice which you criticized in the old days by vesting the power in one man to appoint a committee that will report important legislation.

Mr. POUL. Oh, well, Mr. Speaker, that is an observation which I do not think requires any further answer than a repetition of what I said a moment ago—that the general rules of the House provide that special committees shall be named by the Speaker, and that this is a special committee. That is all I have to say about it, and I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman from North Carolina yield to me a few minutes to make a statement in connection with this legislation?

Mr. POUL. Yes. Certainly, I yield to the gentleman. How much time does the gentleman wish?

Mr. SIMS. Not over three or four minutes.

Mr. POUL. I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to state for the information of the House, as far as I know, how this matter came about.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, ever since I have known anything about the matter, have had jurisdiction of bills concerning the construction of bridges and dams over navigable waters of the United States within the States. The Committee on the Public Lands have had jurisdiction of legislation relating to dams on the public lands of the United States. It appears that the Committee on Agriculture have jurisdiction of so much of the public lands as are embraced in forest reserves. For several years there have been attempts to pass a bill authorizing the building of dams on navigable streams, and I think the bill has been passed twice in the House. I know it was passed at the last session. That bill was reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It was acted on by the House and amended on the floor of the House. The bill was a substitute for a Senate bill, and after the House passed it it went to conference, and the conferees failed to agree. Now, it has been suggested, from a source that perhaps many of you will surmise without my stating in terms, that in order to bring about uniform legislation with reference to the building of dams for water-power purposes, both on the forest reserves, on the public lands, and in navigable streams in the States, the Secretary of War, who has jurisdiction of dams on navigable streams within the States, and the Secretary of the Interior, who has jurisdiction of the public lands, and the Secretary of Agriculture who has jurisdiction of the public lands in the forest reserves, should unite in preparing a bill creating a commission out of the three secretaries, and providing legislation exactly similar for the construction of dams on all navigable rivers, and that a bill be introduced and passed dealing with the whole subject.

Mr. GILLET. That is what I was going to ask the gentleman.

Mr. SIMS. And in order to do that it was suggested—not by myself, for I knew nothing about it—that a rule be brought in authorizing the creation of a committee of three or five members from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, three or five members from the Committee on Public Lands, and the same number from the Committee on Agriculture.

When the matter was submitted to me and to five or six members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I suggested that I would not agree to it without submitting it to the full committee. I did submit it to the full committee, and the committee voted unanimously to agree to such a rule, but it was to be a special committee having jurisdiction of the legislation proposed during the present session of Congress and no further or otherwise. Of course, being a special committee of limited life and jurisdiction it was to be appointed by the

Speaker of the House. I think I have stated substantially all the facts.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Where does it state in the resolution that this is to be a limited committee, or limited in time?

Mr. SIMS. It is a special committee.

Mr. POUL. The committee can only continue during this Congress.

Mr. SIMS. I would not agree to a permanent committee of that kind.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Could Congress authorize a committee for any longer time than this Congress?

Mr. FOSTER. This says a special committee.

Mr. LENROOT. If the gentleman will allow me to make a suggestion, the next Congress adopting the rules of this Congress would not include this committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. Could it not very well incorporate a provision authorizing this committee continued?

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly. The next Congress would have to act specifically on this proposition.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It would take a special order the same as the old pension orders were.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the Committee on Rules brought in a rule providing that the rules of the present Congress should be adopted for that Congress, together with this special committee, it would be continued.

The SPEAKER. All gentlemen are out of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard in opposition to the resolution.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman from North Carolina yield 30 minutes to this side?

Mr. POUL. Yes. I stated that the gentleman from Wisconsin was to control 30 minutes.

Mr. LENROOT. Then, Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I hope Members will give attention to what is coming off in the Congress of the United States. Behind this innocent-looking resolution for a special committee is a bill without a name and without an introducer. The bill is ready with which it is proposed to block the bill S. 1419. If it is necessary to pass this proposed bill, which is all ready, indexed and reported upon by three Secretaries—and I wish I had time to read the report—if it is thought necessary by the Executive that this bill should be passed, why go through this rignarole and red tape in the appointment of a rubber-stamp committee? Why not pass the bill at once without appointing a special committee and a clerk?

Mr. SIMS. There is no clerk.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. There will be a clerk sooner or later. Why not pass the bill in five minutes? Here it is cut and dried. Here is the report of the three Secretaries. The committee will send the bill down to the Secretaries, who will report favorably, then it will go on the calendar, and it will go through this House, actually making rubber stamps out of the new committee and of the membership of the House as well. Here we have the order of three Secretaries, the President favors it, so why have Congress do anything now than O. K. it and let it go? Why not do it in five minutes and have it over with? It is not designed to go into a full discussion of water-power legislation, because your bill is ready and all other bills will be laid on the table.

Mr. SIMS. But we will have the power to amend it or offer a substitute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It is not likely that any amendment or substitute will be adopted with three Secretaries favoring a bureaucratic bill that has been written over in the departments for the express purpose of outwitting the Senate of the United States and making the House of Representatives the tool with which to do it. What does the bill propose? A special commissioner at a salary of \$10,000 and a secretary at \$5,000 a year, and so on. Just one more commission! Just one more arm of Congress which will be stronger than Congress itself. The bill is bureaucratic, written by bureau chiefs and indorsed by three Secretaries. It gives no western States any hand in the control of the water power within their confines and no share in any of the returns. It fixes it so that a western State having a Federal domain of 50 per cent will remain forever in that position. The leases are renewable and the revenue is to go to the Federal Government and not to the States. It provides in a recapture clause that the Government may take

over at the end of 50 years the water-power plant and pay only the original cost of it. Will that invite the capital which the West needs? I know half a dozen places, one in particular in the State of Washington, where if the water power can be developed a city of 100,000 people will develop in 10 years. Twenty thousand men can make fortunes there, but a water-power bill which offers only 6 per cent to those who might invest twenty-five to thirty million dollars will not invite capital under the terms of this bill. I have not time to discuss water-power legislation, however, but simply desire to call attention that this is a cut-and-dried proposition, a cut-and-dried membership committee, a bill prepared for it, and the House of Representatives has nothing to do but to put on the rubber stamp of approval.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. We have been trying for many years to get water-power legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is no reason why Congress should abrogate its powers any further.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is it not desirable from the gentleman's standpoint to at least make some move toward getting legislation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Not if it is necessary for Congress to adopt a bill named outside, printed in advance, and a committee named in advance—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Oh, that is aside from the question; the gentleman is speaking against the adoption of the rule. The whole purpose of the rule is to try to bring about a condition in which legislation can be considered, no matter from what source it may come.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Could not a bill come out of a properly constituted committee, as did the Ferris bill?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Water-power legislation has been tied up for years. We have not gotten anywhere, and though this may be a feeble stagger, we are making an effort.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Suppose we abdicate to the bureaus on every proposition on which the House and the Senate fail to agree—have some chief write a bill and bring it down here with instructions to pass it. I hope that Congress will open its eyes as to what it is doing. It is ceasing to be a coordinate branch of the Government. This nameless, numberless bill, this hybrid report of the three Secretaries, and this special resolution for an especially selected committee are the final proofs.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS].

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing mysterious about what has happened, and there is nothing to wound the feelings of the gentleman from Washington or anyone else. The facts are these: The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, headed by Judge SIMS, has jurisdiction over a portion of the water power of the country, about 28 per cent. The Committee on the Public Lands has jurisdiction over about 72 per cent. Each committee has been trying to do its duty and give an adequate water-power policy to the country, so that 30,000,000 horsepower of hydroelectric energy might not every year find its way to the sea, idle and totally wasted. Members of these committees have endeavored to bring this about, and each time we have failed. Twice, step by step, under the closest scrutiny of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], and with leaders on this side, the House has passed a bill without a dissenting vote. That bill bore my name, was worked out by the committee, and indorsed by the department. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has had similar experiences with their bill, for it failed each time to get through the Senate. Three departments of the Government had jurisdiction over the water-power bill; the War Department and the Board of Army Engineers, having jurisdiction over navigable streams, have 28 per cent of the water power within their jurisdiction. The Interior Department and the Agricultural Department, in the public lands and forest reserves, have about 72.6 per cent of the water power of the country under their jurisdiction. Each has struggled with the policy it thought was right, neither was able to bring here a composite plan that would be acceptable to the Senate. Those three Secretaries—Mr. Baker, Mr. Lane, and Mr. Houston—very properly, as I believe, came together and formulated a bill which they think provides an adequate water-power policy for this country. I do not now place detailed approval on it, but think it essentially correct in principle.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, as I believe, very properly passed unanimously a resolution agreeing to come in and try to create a new committee made up of these committees that would agree upon some adequate policy. The Committee on the Public Lands, of which I am a member, did

the same thing. Both committees are here asking that this be done, and the Rules Committee, very properly I think, has brought in a rule providing for this procedure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Which committee of those is the one that considered and brought about this particular bill which it is proposed to submit?

Mr. FERRIS. So far as I am concerned, there is absolutely no secret about this matter, and I am glad to advise the gentleman that the three Cabinet officers who are to ultimately administer the policy have taken the initiative and have brought in a bill to us which we can dissect and work over and finally prepare. There is nothing mysterious about that. On the contrary, it is a very great help.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. A bill that they indorsed and asked Congress to pass.

Mr. FERRIS. No; they did not. They are trying to help, and they are helping. We need their help, and I am sure help will be welcomed from every source.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to ask the gentleman whether or not it is a fact that this bill that is now presented by the Secretary does or does not embody the principles of the Ferris bill that have been indorsed by the House.

Mr. FERRIS. I was going to get to that. If I may, in the short time that I have, I want to say that it is not a moot question as to what are the real essentials of a proper water-supply policy. I think both sides of this Chamber are committed to the essential characteristics and elements of a correct water-power policy, and I shall go over hurriedly what are embodied in this tentative or proposed bill. They are taken from the best in the bill of the Public Lands Committee and the bill from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. There are 10 essentials which this proposed bill embodies.

First. No legislation, Executive order, or department ruling should permit the patenting or the title in fee to pass out of the Federal Government under any conditions. The fee title should be reserved in perpetuity to the United States.

This bill carries such a provision.

Second. The dam sites should be leased for a period of time not longer than 50 years, without any entangling alliances or phrases difficult to understand, on which the courts might quibble or debate as to the relative rights of the Federal Government and the lessee after the term has expired.

Third. The recapture provision should provide that all non-perishable property, such as land, water rights, dam sites, good will, and so forth, should go back to the Federal Government at actual cost, and that all perishable property in connection with the plant should come back to the Federal Government at the end of the lease at its fair value. In both cases the interest of the public is conserved and made certain.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Why do we not just pass this bill now?

Mr. FERRIS. No one asks the gentleman to do that, no one asks the committee to do that, no Cabinet officer asks to do that, and no Member of the House would do that. They merely suggest it, and we are to pick it to pieces and make it over, and the gentleman will help do it, for he knows a good deal about water power.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I would like to help do it, but I understand the committee is already selected.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman does not want to make a misstatement of fact. The committee is not selected. No one knows that better than the Speaker. I dare say the Speaker has not now made up his mind as to a single Member of that committee. I certainly have not suggested a name to him, and I do not believe Judge SIMS has suggested a name to him. I do not believe the chairman of the Committee on Rules has suggested a name to him, and I doubt if he has a name in his mind. So I know the gentleman does not want to muddy the water with that.

Fourth. Strong, clear, well-understood provisions should be inserted in the lease contract for the revocation of the permit for a violation of the conditions thereof.

Fifth. Provisions should be inserted in the lease requiring diligence and prompt construction of the plant so that the property may not be held for speculative purposes.

Every bill that is adopted by this House ought to have a clause providing for diligence in the construction of water-power plants, so that they might not hold them in cold storage and thereby increase the grasp which the water-power monopoly now has.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FERRIS. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Has this bill any provision by which the Government itself may develop any of these water powers for governmental purposes?

Mr. FERRIS. I do not think it has. I have not examined it critically, but I do not think it has.

Sixth. A royalty or rental for the use of dam sites and the property of the Federal Government should be required in all cases except for municipalities which furnish current to consumers without profit.

Royalty or tax or payment or rental, or whatever you call it, ought to be contained in every bill, so that this Congress may not be subject to the indictment and the charge that we are giving away 35,000,000 hydroelectric horsepower energy of this country. That has been one of the main controversies between the House and the Senate. They have contended all along that if we put any sort of tax, any sort of charge, on water power, we never would have any development.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. If the gentleman will permit, in view of the gentleman's statement that there is no provision whereby the Government can utilize this water power itself, are not we proposing to grant away a great asset of the people comparable to coal and minerals of various kinds?

Mr. FERRIS. We do not grant away a thing. The Government retains fee title of every water-power site and every power site in this country. It does not grant away a single horsepower of hydroelectric energy. We merely lease it for a term of years and charge them for the right to use it. We grant away nothing. If the gentleman is a friend of Government ownership, I do not know whether he is or not, this bill will not meet with his approval. It is not a Government-ownership plan. I am not yet convinced that the Government of the United States can blow the nose of every citizen every morning in the year and do it better than the citizen can do it himself. I am not for Government ownership of water power.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It can blow the nose of Congress, however.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman can speak for his own good self.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am trying to speak, I am sure.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Does not the gentleman believe the Government has the power and fitness to utilize some of the great natural resources of the country for the purpose of public benefit?

Mr. FERRIS. Undoubtedly.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Why does that principle apply to minerals and not apply to water power?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LENROOT. I yield the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. FERRIS. Now, if the gentleman will let me proceed, I would be very glad to yield if I could. I will say to the gentleman from Alabama that the Government does not operate mines, as the gentleman knows, so that question has no analogy.

Seventh. The Federal Government should at all times maintain the paramountcy, so it will at all times have full control over water power to the end that the natural monopoly of the water flowing from the highlands to the lowlands and finding its way back to the sea should not be a monopoly by which one man or set of men may torture all the rest of us who, perchance, use water power and hydroelectric energy.

Eighth. Annual reports should be exacted from the power companies, so that the public might at all times know of their acts and doings. This provision is highly essential.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield to me for one simple question?

Mr. FERRIS. I really can not.

Mr. MADDEN. Is there a provision in this law to authorize an audit of expenditures made by the people who will have the grant made to them?

Mr. FERRIS. I think it does. I am not the last word on this bill, as I have not given it much attention.

Ninth. The Federal Government should reserve to itself full power to fix rates for service, capitalization, bond issues, and so forth, in interstate projects and, where there is no public-utilities commission for this purpose, in intrastate projects.

This is essential, so that the people can tell something about what is going on with a natural monopoly that belongs to them.

Tenth. Each lease, permit, or consent of Congress should contain a provision that upon proof that any such permittees, lessees, or grantees have conspired to prevent the development of water power or to limit the output of already constructed plants the lease should be revocable in a court of competent jurisdiction. Water power is a natural monopoly, and the greatest sort of care and caution should at all times be exercised in issuing permits that authorize its creation by strong, write,

vigorous laws and regulations. Something of this sort is due the teeming millions of America, who have the right to expect that this great national blessing will be carefully preserved for them and carefully preserved in their interest.

Water power, as is well known in this House, is a natural monopoly. Only a few can have it. The people ought to have something to do with the control of it. There are 35,000,000—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit an interruption? Will the gentleman yield for one question only?

Mr. FERRIS. All right; go ahead.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. If it is a natural monopoly that should be given a private corporation under lease, what provision is there for the regulation of rates?

Mr. FERRIS. We have complete power reserved in the Federal Government in this department bill, and it should be at all times maintained. I will say to the gentleman. Now, one word. There are 35,000,000 horsepower of hydroelectric energy in the United States, as estimated by the water-power engineers. Some go above that and some go below, but they all agree that that is a fair estimate. Only 6,000,000 of the 35,000,000 is in any sort of use, and the rest is running idly to the sea, a total waste. Is the Congress going to allow 110,000,000 of people to pay \$30 a ton or \$50 a ton for coal while there are 35,000,000 horsepower of hydroelectric energy running away to the sea, a total waste, every year?

I have tried, I know the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has tried, my committee has tried, but we have failed, and this is an additional trial, an additional chance of which we should avail ourselves.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FERRIS. I am afraid my time is getting away.

Mr. AUSTIN. It will be a very short question.

Mr. FERRIS. Go ahead.

Mr. AUSTIN. What about the regulation of the price of oil that is proposed to be taken off the Government reservations under the bill which the gentleman had passed through the House?

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman must know that I can not go into that. I would like to discuss it with him, but I have only another minute. The only thing I want to say is this: That I appeal to the members of the committee that I know are in harmony with what I am saying, and to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, that I know is in harmony, to let us get together with a long and a strong pull and put up a water-power policy that will induce the Senate to take it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT].

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of gossip, which I have heard and I have no doubt other Members have heard, about the personnel of this new committee, but the chairman of the Committee on Rules tells us there has been no combination made and no program; that it is left, as the wording of the rule provides, in the hands of the Speaker. That to me is entirely satisfactory. I recognize the propriety of some members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, some members of the Committee on the Public Lands, perhaps some members of the Committee on Agriculture, who have had this subject in charge, going on to such new committee, and I have no doubt the Speaker will recognize them. I have no doubt also that the Speaker will recognize that in the appointment on this committee questions of geography and different attitudes upon this whole problem should be recognized. And I have no doubt, consequently, that it will be a fair committee, representing the whole country and all interests in this controversy.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Has not the gentleman some doubt all the time, even in the case of a special committee, of this manner of selecting a committee on the part of the House?

Mr. GILLETT. The rule is that all special committees shall be selected by the Speaker, and I am glad to have this committee selected by the Speaker, having entire confidence that all sections will be recognized, as well as the various points of view on this problem.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. I will.

Mr. TOWNER. Is it not practically necessary that some action of this kind be taken if we are to take action at all?

Mr. GILLETTE. That is what I was going to say. I think it is criminal that no action has been taken before on this vital subject. Here are great water-power possibilities all over the country waiting for development. Here is capital waiting to develop them, and yet because Congress will not allow it to be done they are all tied up. Why, there are hundreds of thousands of unharnessed horsepower which would save hundreds of thousands of tons of coal, but simply because Congress has not acted, and apparently will not act, that is all wasted. Apparently the present committees are not going to act. I am sorry to say that I am not very sanguine that even with this new committee a bill will be passed, but it apparently is the only chance, and therefore I am willing to try it because, as I say, Mr. Speaker, in my view it is criminal that there should be this delay in the development of water power. I am particularly interested because of the Connecticut River.

The United States has not the slightest interest or title in that river, except by its power over a theoretically navigable stream, a stream which at Windsor Locks has rapids utterly unnavigable. For years there have been parties ready to obstruct this theoretically navigable stream, which is the only way of making it navigable, by building a dam or lock—

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts whether in his opinion the proposed bill would bar the Government from getting in and developing any water power it might need?

Mr. GILLETTE. This proposed bill, marked "Confidential," was not given me until just now. I never saw it until a few moments ago.

Mr. POU. If the gentleman from Massachusetts will permit, I had this bill printed by the request of at least 25 Members of the House.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why was not notice given to that effect?

Mr. TOWNER. It was given, and on the floor of the House.

Mr. GILLETTE. Here is a river—the Connecticut—theoretically navigable, and capital is ready to put a big dam across it and build locks without expense to the Government and make it navigable, which it is not now; and, in addition, such a dam would produce thousands of horsepower which now is lying there idle because Congress will not enact any legislation on this subject. It is an outrage. I have no doubt that same condition exists all over the country, and it is a shame that we should not enact some legislation of this kind. It is an outrage that this mere theoretical jurisdiction which Congress has over such a river as that should prevent both actual navigation and actual use of the water power.

Therefore I hope that this new committee will be able to do what Congress has not been able to do in the past, and that it will give us some legislation, although I am not very confident about it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Wisconsin use some more of his time?

Mr. LENROOT. I am willing to. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish I could see my way clear to support this resolution, because I realize, as I think possibly all the Members of the House do, the importance of having legislation on the subject of water power.

But I am opposed to the creation of this new committee, first, because in my opinion the subject of water power on navigable streams and the questions involved in the utilization of water power on the public lands are so dissimilar that they can best be handled and disposed of by separate committees.

It occurs to me that it will be difficult to get a committee of 18 that are thoroughly well informed in relation to all the problems connected with the utilization of water power under such diverse conditions. For instance, the chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands, Mr. FERRIS, referring just a moment ago to one of the fundamental propositions, as I understand it, that should be contained in a water-power bill, stated that under no circumstances should there be a grant of water. Now, when you come to the question of the public lands of the West, in the arid States, the Federal Government owns no water, and there can not be any such a thing under the constitution of those States as a grant of ownership in water. The only right that any one can secure is the right to use, under certain conditions and under certain control. I just use that as an illustration.

Mr. FERRIS. I do not want the gentleman to understand that I meant to say that the Government can grant ownership of water. But we own the eye of the needle.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes. The gentleman wants to have the fact of ownership of certain lands made the vehicle for the laying of a burden that I think ought not be laid on the development of the resources of the Western States.

I am not in entire agreement with the attitude of the Committee on the Public Lands on this question, but I would much prefer to leave the question with the Committee on the Public Lands, with its membership made up largely from the public-land States, than to intrust it to a committee selected so as to cover the entire country.

Then, another thing. I am not altogether happy over the conditions and circumstances surrounding the presentation of this matter to us. The proposition of a new committee is accompanied by a carefully prepared and properly indorsed and O. K'd and viséed bill, which the committee is supposed to take up and approve and present to Congress.

The gentleman who just spoke said the committee could take up such a bill and amend it and modify it as it saw fit. The trouble with that proposition is that a bill once prepared along certain lines can not well be modified and amended except in a way to somewhat modify the carrying out of the theory on which the bill is drafted. One of the difficulties we have had here for quite a number of years past in respect to bills is a growing disposition to take our legislation from the departments. I shall be happy when the bills that are presented to the House shall have been prepared by the Members of the House or by committees of the House, and I shall be much more inclined to forgive and overlook errors in bills of that kind than in bills that are prepared for us and presented to us and over which we have no control or supervision except in the way of possibly changing by some minor amendments some relatively unimportant feature of the legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Not now. We all know that when a bill is presented to a committee, drafted along certain lines and on a certain theory, you can not easily modify the basic and important provisions, you can not greatly change the controlling lines along which the legislation has been prepared, without practically discarding the measure, and that it is practically impossible to do if the bill has any considerable support or influence behind it. The best that can be done under such circumstances is to make minor changes here and there, leaving the measure, in the main, as it was introduced—good, bad, or indifferent, as the case may be.

We need water-power legislation, it is true, but we ought to have sane and sensible legislation. I wish I were more hopeful of securing it under this plan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. McARTHUR].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, in the consideration of this rule we are confronted by a condition, not a theory.

Congress during the past two sessions, when this important subject has been under discussion, has been utterly unable to arrive at any conclusive understanding that would give to the country that water-power legislation which is so much needed to develop our latent resources, particularly in the far West. There has been a disagreement between this body and the Senate, with the result that we have not arrived at any common understanding where we can get legislation to promote the development of those resources. We have divergent views on the different angles of this water-power question. It is apparent that if we proceed along the same line that we have proceeded on before and have bills considered by the same committees as heretofore there will continue to be that disagreement between the House and the Senate, and the result will be that there will be no legislation of any character.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McARTHUR. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. What will the Government receive as profits by this action?

Mr. McARTHUR. I can not answer that question. That is a matter that must be answered by experts.

Mr. LITTLE. Will we get anything?

Mr. McARTHUR. I can not answer that now. That must be answered at the proper time by the proper authorities.

But here we have a proposition to create a special committee to take up the question of water-power legislation. We have failed dismally in the past to get anything under the old arrangement, and if this new proposition opens up any avenue or holds out any prospect of getting such legislation as the country is entitled to, I say, "For Heaven's sake, let us create this commission and let it go ahead." [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORRIS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Dakota is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I consider the legislation to be considered in reference to the leasing, development, and control of the water power of the country to be the most important legislation that will be considered during this Congress outside of actual war measures. I quite agree with other gentlemen that the country should now have definite legislation on this subject. This special committee will assist, I believe, in presenting legislation to Congress that the Congress can agree upon. I trust, however, that the members of the committee that may be appointed under the provisions of this resolution will not consider the great question either lightly or hastily. The committee should, as suggested by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], guard against the danger of reporting a bill that may be ready prepared and submitted to the committee.

The people of the country—particularly the people of the West—are deeply interested in Federal legislation for the control and development of the water power of the country. They are interested in having conserved for the people of the country as well as can be the great water-power resources of the Nation. The thought and the view of the great masses of the American people on this subject should be very carefully considered by the committee in the making up of any bill to be favorably recommended to the House. It seems to me the Government should retain the fullest possible control of the great water-power resources of the country for the interests of all the people, and that whatever legislation this Congress enacts, it should be with this view in mind. I am personally in favor of having a special committee appointed which will be able to give sufficient time and the most careful consideration to all bills introduced on this most important subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALEXANDER). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how the time stands now?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 9 minutes and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] has five minutes.

Mr. LENROOT. Has the gentleman from North Carolina more than one speech?

Mr. POU. I will yield one minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALMON].

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that I am heartily in favor of the rule. There are more reasons to-day than ever in the history of our Nation for legislation that will result in water-power development. On account of the scarcity of fuel and the high price of coal, the reason for water-power development is more urgent and more important than ever before in the history of our country. I believe this committee ought to be provided for and that this House should use its best efforts at this time to bring about proper legislation upon this question. I do not understand the rule to mean that this committee of 18 is to be selected from the three committees—Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Agriculture, and the Public Lands. I do not believe that the Speaker ought to be confined to the selection of this committee from those three committees. He may find it best to select from those committees, but it may be that there are States in the Union more directly interested in water-power development, because they have the greatest amount of water power, which have no representation on these committees, and I trust that the Speaker will take that into consideration in appointing the committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LENROOT. I yield half a minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as we have plenty of time this afternoon I will use my half minute in asking unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes, not to be taken out of the time allotted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for five minutes, not to be taken out of the time allotted to the committee. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] that the situation which now presents itself is a sad commentary on the ability of this Congress to carry through much needed legislation. In fact, it is but little better than a national scandal and disgrace that we have not acted on this subject before this time. We are contending against a power in this war that exercises its authority in the most autocratic manner, that proceeds with an energy and an efficiency that leaves nothing lacking, that acts with astonishing swiftness and velocity, commensurate with every emergency, and at this time here we are. We have tried to enact several bills. We have accomplished nothing. As the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] tells us, millions of horsepower are running to waste, and in the meantime homes are without sufficient coal; and worse than that, our munition factories are actually shutting down for want of coal, and our Army and our Navy are being deprived of much-needed ammunition because these factories can not be run on account of the want of power. Yet here we are, with millions of horsepower running to waste. I am willing to take the chance of some mistakes, of something possibly being done wrong as a result of this action if only we get something done in this emergency. The growing need is something that will not be denied, and if this House exercises its power and authority, as it ought to, and goes before the country and presents this issue before it, the country will sustain the Congress in demanding that some action be taken, and some action will be taken as a result of it.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, it has been assumed by some of the speakers that there has been handed down from the executive branch of the Government, first, a bill, a confidential print of which has been made, and, second, this proposed rule creating a special committee. Now, in so far as this special committee is concerned, I wish to say that the first suggestion of this course came from myself. I am very glad that the President has adopted the suggestion and brought it before the Committee on Rules. We were confronted with this situation: As has been said, for years Congress has been endeavoring to enact water-power legislation, and it has failed in one body or the other, or there has been a deadlock in conference. Now, as has been stated, a bill has been prepared combining all the water-power propositions in one bill, and there is a very good reason for that, because the main essential principles relating to water-power legislation are common to both water powers upon the public lands and upon navigable streams. There are questions as to each that are entirely distinct. For instance, upon navigable waters we have the question of navigation. Upon the public lands we have the question of the use of the public lands aside from the actual water-power sites themselves; but the length of the charter, the conditions under which the license is to be granted, the conditions under which it may be taken over by the Government, the compensation to be charged, if any; those are principles that are common to both propositions, and legislation upon them ought to be uniform.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Just for a question.

Mr. FESS. The bill as it now is proposed could not be referred to any one committee?

Mr. LENROOT. I am just coming to that. That being true, that this is legislation embodying more than one proposition, if this was introduced by a Member, and the Speaker, called upon to refer it, he would be compelled to choose between the Committee on the Public Lands and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Each committee naturally would be jealous of its own jurisdiction with reference to this question, and there would be a contest on the floor of the House as to which committee the bill should go. The only practical thing, the only feasible thing, is to create such a committee as is proposed by this rule. I am frank to say that, while there has been no intimation, so far as I know, of anybody talking with the Speaker—I do not know of anybody who has had a word of conversation with him on this subject—I do assume that a majority of the members of this special committee will come from committees that have jurisdiction of this subject and are especially familiar with it.

In reference to the members of the committee it was suggested in the Committee on Rules that this resolution expressly provide that so many men come from this committee, so many from that, and so many from the other. That would involve this: Naturally there would be three Democrats and two Republicans to each committee, and the natural result would be that there would be a very large disproportion in the membership of that committee between the Republicans and the Democrats, and

while there is no partisanship in this proposition, when the House is so evenly divided, the Speaker ought not to be bound by any such thing, and I assume, although I have not had a word with him—I assume that when this committee comes to be appointed it will be in the ratio of 10 Democrats to 8 Republicans; but he is left entirely free in that respect.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I am sure the gentleman would not want to leave the impression that anyone insisted in the Committee on Rules in attempting to fix the number.

Mr. LENROOT. Not the slightest. It was a tentative suggestion that that should be done, and when discussed it was unanimously agreed that the resolution should not do it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And the question of party representation was raised by me.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; raised by the gentleman from Tennessee himself, so there was no contest in it in that regard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I suppose the gentleman expects that some Members will be placed on the committee who can present a minority-report from the standpoint of western States and western revenue.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman would expect the Speaker of this House, in appointing this committee, to have all views represented in so far as they have developed themselves into groups or different lines of opinion, and that both sides will be represented on this committee.

I may say, however, that I would also expect that the Speaker, in appointing this committee, would appoint a majority representing principles repeatedly indorsed by the House of Representatives in the bills heretofore passed. [Applause.] I am willing to rest upon that and I am sure when this committee is appointed there will be representatives upon it of the two different views, because we may as well recognize that throughout all this legislation the difficulty has been that there has been a small group in this House representing one view as to the water-power legislation and the majority in the Senate have agreed with them, and a majority in this House have represented another view and the minority in the Senate have agreed with them. This resolution proposes a plan whereby we can consider this entire question with the reasonable hope that before the Sixty-fifth Congress shall adjourn we will have secured a solution of this troublesome question.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I agree with the gentleman that the resolution ought to be passed, but, in view of the importance of the question and it not being a purely select committee, in view of the fact that it is charged with such important legislation, why should not the committee be elected by the House?

Mr. LENROOT. The only suggestion I would make is that the same method is provided in this resolution that is provided with reference to all special and select committees. The rule in providing for the election of committees only provides for the standing committees. I do not know why the rule should be changed and enlarged at this time.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The rule provides that the Speaker shall appoint select committees and committees of conference, but this is a committee charged with most important legislation.

Mr. LENROOT. Very often we have select committees charged with most important duties, and yet under the general rules of the House the Speaker appoints those committees. This committee, while it will last through this Congress, when they report the legislation, whatever it may be, and it passes the House, its functions are over, except some members of it may be in the committee of conference. It is in every sense a temporary committee, and when the work is done the committee is gone. It will not be renewed at another session unless, perchance, this legislation should not be concluded.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Allow me to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that many Members have dwelt upon the personnel of the committee. I have not the slightest doubt but that the Speaker will be most careful in considering appointments and that the committee will be well chosen; but this very system of appointing committees has been a great issue before the country. The predecessor of the present Speaker appointed his committees most wisely, but that was not the question. It was a question of the method of appointment. If we are to have a committee which it is conceded will deal with one of the most important questions before this Congress; is it not of sufficient importance for this House to proceed and elect it and not have it appointed by the Speaker?

Mr. LENROOT. So far as I am concerned, I think the result in this particular case would be practically the same whether the House selects the committee or whether the Speaker appoints it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The practical result was much the same before, several years ago, when we deprived the Speaker of that power.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, it seems that there is one proposition about which there is no controversy. It is agreed that it would be criminal to postpone action indefinitely upon this legislation. Now, the Committee on Rules has tried to proceed by unanimous consent as near as it could, and this resolution is the result of the conference of the Committee on Rules, and it comes in here with a unanimous report.

It seems that this is the best hope for legislation of this kind. There has been nothing cut and dried about the matter. There has been no limitation put upon anybody, and nobody has any authority to speak for the Speaker of the House. All gentlemen can do is to make predictions. We present this resolution as the best hope for action from this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina moves the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE RECORD.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, on page 837 of the RECORD of yesterday I find the following:

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, that will be done.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RAKER. I make the motion, Mr. Speaker, to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman can not make that motion. The gentleman can move to reconsider, but he can not move to lay on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not understand the point of order made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]. The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] moves to reconsider.

Mr. RAKER. And lay that motion on the table.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. No.

The SPEAKER. You can not.

That would indicate that the ruling of the Chair is that one could not make a motion to reconsider and lay that motion on the table at the same time. I rise to ask under a parliamentary inquiry whether it is not proper for a Member to make the motion to reconsider and at the same time make a motion to lay that motion on the table?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, the RECORD does not state accurately, according to my recollection at least, what I had in mind. I did not mean to make a point of order that the gentleman could not make the motion to reconsider and lay on the table. What I intended to do was to demand a division of the question in order that I might object to the latter part of it. Undoubtedly under the general parliamentary law a Member can make a motion to reconsider and that same Member can make a motion to lay that on the table.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. There is no doubt about that. What I desired to do and what I desired was to have a severance of the matter.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood that, and understands it now. Both of those motions can be made. There is no necessity for making both at once—that is, you are not compelled to—but one can file a motion to reconsider any time during the day on which the thing occurs or the next day, and you can let that motion hang up as long as you please, until the end of the Congress, the Chair thinks. The motion to lay upon the table cuts out debate. The motion to reconsider is debatable. In the confusion the Chair did not know, but supposed that what was desired was an opportunity to get at the matter to-day. A Member can undoubtedly make both motions.

There is one other matter to which the Chair wishes to direct attention. Two gentlemen suggested yesterday that the Constitution provided there must be a roll call on a constitutional amendment. It does not provide anything of the sort. Everybody was rising, however, and, without ruling on the matter, the Chair ordered the Clerk to call the roll, because there was no use wasting time about it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.
The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes upon the subject of the delegation of power to Congress over railroads, not to interfere with privileged business.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that after the reading of the Journal and the clearing up of business on the Speaker's table on Monday next he be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS MONONGAHELA RIVER, W. VA.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 6176, to authorize the city of Fairmont to construct and operate a bridge across the Monongahela River at or near the city of Fairmont, in the State of West Virginia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] is entitled to 45 minutes at this time. If he is agreeable to permitting the gentleman to bring this up at this time, the Chair will put the request.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman upon his assurance that it will not take over five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk reported the bill by title.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the gentleman state why there is urgency of taking this up instead of waiting until the Unanimous Consent Calendar could be called regularly.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that this bill is simply an extension of an act that was approved on the 17th day of April, 1916. Bonds were voted for the purpose of constructing the bridge, but because of a technical defect in the bond issue the city of Fairmont was unable to finance the project within a year following the approval of the act. Later the bonds were disposed of and the city began the construction of the bridge. The War Department stopped the construction on the ground that under the bridge law after a period of one year had elapsed from the approval of the original act, the bridge could not be constructed without an extension of time granted in a regular legal way. At the present time there is a force of men idle, and they will continue to be idle and can do nothing until the bill has been passed authorizing an extension of the time in which to construct the bridge.

This nonresident contracting firm is on the ground to do the work, but they can not proceed—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It involves, then, the payment of a lot of idle men unless this goes through?

Mr. NEELY. Precisely so.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the city of Fairmont, a municipal corporation under the laws of the State of West Virginia, is hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Monongahela River at or near the city of Fairmont, in Marion County, W. Va., at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge authorized by the act of Congress approved April 17, 1916, to be built across the Monongahela River at or near the city of Fairmont, W. Va., by the city of Fairmont, are hereby extended to one year and three years, respectively, from the 17th day of April, 1917.

"SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved."

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill extending the time for the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River at or near the city of Fairmont, W. Va."

On motion of Mr. NEELY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on next Monday. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina whether, Monday next being District day, the Committee on the District of Columbia will have any business before the House?

Mr. KITCHIN. I do not think it will, but we will meet on Monday because I understand the Committee on Indian Affairs will be ready to report their appropriation bill.

Mr. MADDEN. And that bill will be taken up for consideration?

Mr. KITCHIN. It will be taken up on Tuesday. It will be introduced on Monday, and it has to go over for a day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

NOMINATIONS TO FILL VACANCIES.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk some nominations to fill vacancies on committees, and move their adoption.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report them.

The Clerk read as follows:

SWAGAR SHERLEY, of Kentucky, to be chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

WILLIAM E. COX, of Indiana, to be a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

WILLIAM KETTNER, of California, to be a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

SAMUEL W. BEAKES, of Michigan, to be a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

EARL H. BESHLIN, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and the Committee on Patents.

The following named gentlemen to be members of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures:

CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona.

HENRY B. STEAGALL, of Alabama.

AUGUSTINE LONERGAN, of Connecticut.

TOM D. MCKEOWN, of Oklahoma.

EARL H. BESHLIN, of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. Are there any other nominations? If not, the question will be on these.

The question was taken, and the nominations were agreed to.

INCREASE IN TWO COMMITTEES.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, the rules of the House provide that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds shall be composed of 19 members and the Committee on the Territories shall be composed of 16 members. At the first of the session, in the printed document filed by the Clerk of the House, of the standing committees of the House there was given to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds 20 members and to the Committee on the Territories 17 members and, therefore, it appeared that there were more vacancies than there were on those two committees. In consequence of that, Mr. GILLET, on the other side of the House, presented nominations filling the apparent vacancies as they appeared upon the printed document, so that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds now has one more than it was entitled to and the Committee on the Territories one more. As I said, he was misled by this printed document, and I therefore ask unanimous consent—I have conferred with the members of the Committee on Rules and Mr. GILLET and others before preparing this resolution—for the immediate consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 222.

Resolved, That the rules of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth Congress be, and they are hereby, amended so that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds shall consist of 20 members and the Committee on the Territories of 17 members.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] is recognized for 25 minutes.

INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks leave to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, on the 6th of December last I introduced the following resolution, namely:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 173) to initiate the organization of an international league to secure a durable peace.

Resolved, etc., That the Congress of the United States shall initiate the organization of an international league to secure a durable peace, and for that purpose shall, through the President of the United States, invite the representatives of the parliaments of all the countries now at war with the central powers to convene in joint conference, to be held at the city of Washington, D. C.

To the average man the phrase "international league" carries with it the idea of something vague, intangible, and infinitely distant. It has always seemed inconceivable that the nations of the world should be able to cooperate. The world's experience of the last three years has shown the contrary. To-day 21 nations, representing every race, every continent, every tongue, and every nationality, are engaged in a common and joint effort against four powers. We have in effect an international alliance, international cooperation, an international league. The thing that seemed a dream of dreamers has come to be true. The present world struggle is not a war between races. The Anglo-Saxon and the Teuton are of the same racial stock, although on opposite sides now.

The English language has probably one-third words of Germanic origin. Some of the States engaged in this war are not nations in any sense of the word, but are artificial States, such, for instance, as the State of Austro-Hungary, a conglomerate of nationalities and races, held together by force. It is not a war of races nor of nations, it is a war of the world against four powers, two of which are States and not nations.

The concrete problem which presents itself to us is, can we extend the principle of international cooperation, now shown by the war to be a practicable proposition, into the future? Can we extend its operation so that it will embrace the world, and can we extend it so that it should have as its primary and sole object to secure, as far as it is humanly possible, a durable peace? The four powers have so far been able to defy the rest of the world. But is it not primarily due to the fact that, with the exception of Russia, France, and England, each of the other allied powers entered the contest when it suited its own convenience? Does anybody doubt that had there been an international league to take simultaneous action against the invader of Serbia we would have been spared the present world tragedy? That a league to prevent the recurrence of war is desirable no one would dare dispute. No people on earth are for war. No man loves it, except perhaps a few savages, to be found here and there, who revert to the brute.

The normal state of mankind is peace. That it is desirable all the nations of the world and all religions agree. The fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man constitute one of the fundamental concepts of every religious system. The pity of it is that these sacred words have been used so long by those who render lip prayer only that the phrase has lost all meaning, and one is almost ashamed to utter the sentiment. I intend to prove that not only is it desirable to establish lasting order in the relations of peoples but that much progress has been made in the direction of finding the proposition a practicable one. Astonishing progress has been made. We find a gentleman of judicial mind, a former President of the United States, Mr. Taft, uniting on the proposition of the desirability and possibility of such a league with the most extreme of extreme types, the present leader of the Russian revolutionary movement, Trotsky, who has been denounced by the press as an impossible man. We find that in the French Republic an international association to secure peace is considered one of the most vital things for which the French people are fighting. To France the organization of a world association which shall insure permanent peace is a matter of life and death. Here we have a people of a noble and distinct civilization, a people who have made contributions to the world's progress, unequaled by any other nation, but numerically much smaller than their immediate neighbors. There are only 38,000,000 of them, and right near them is a nation, an intellectually and physically vigorous people, 70,000,000 strong, and offering in a physical sense a very serious menace to their existence. And as you read the proceedings of the French Chamber of Deputies you find that nothing touches them to the quick so much as the suggestion that this war may end without a permanent association for a league to secure peace.

Take the British labor movement. And, by the way, the British labor movement is wide-awake, intelligent, and alert. They dare say things, and they are listened to. It is they that are responsible for the recent candor of Lloyd George.

In the draft of a manifesto on the war aims of British labor made public in England on December 17, 1917, by the joint action of the parliamentary committee of the Trade Union Congress and the executive committee of the Labor Party they

lay special stress on the immediate necessity of making it an essential part of the treaty of peace itself "that there shall be forthwith established a supernational authority or league of nations."

This manifesto anticipated Lloyd George's definite statement of war objects by 15 days.

The Socialists of Russia demand an international league. The Socialists of Germany demand an international league to secure peace. The Socialists of the world have always demanded it. They were always wise enough to see that, no matter how much progress a nation was making, no matter how rapidly it was advancing, that the life of the country and all its progress would be checked by a conflict with another nation. They considered democratic control of foreign and international relations just as vital and just as essential as popular rule in domestic affairs.

My first act as the Socialist Representative in the Sixty-fourth Congress was to suggest in a resolution, among the terms of peace, the formation of an international court of arbitration, with the commercial boycott as a means of punishment for disobedience.

A few days ago I received by mail a pamphlet called "War and Transportation," by Calvin Thomas, ex-commissioner of docks of New York City, containing an address made before the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce on December 11, 1917. Now, the last person in the world from whom I would expect any advanced ideas would be an official of the city of New York. [Laughter.] But here it is. In speaking before the Chamber of Commerce of Cleveland he says:

National sovereignty and international anarchy are interchangeable terms.

How bold! How radical! I take it that he means to say that the attempt by a nation to say to the rest of the world, "I want this done, and I care not at whose expense; I care not whom it may injure; I care not what nation may be adversely affected" amounts to international anarchy and that war is its culminating stage.

Let me come back to Mr. Taft's proposition of a league to enforce peace.

He proposes that the nations shall form an international league to enforce peace; that there shall be a court of arbitration and a council of conciliation; that the court of arbitration shall have the power to render a decision which shall be binding upon the litigants; that the council of conciliation, as its name implies, or a branch of the same court, shall have as its function the conciliation of the disputants.

He divides that court into two parts, for the reason that he divides the disputes which arise among nations into two classes, justiciable and nonjusticiable. Justiciable disputes among nations shall be submitted to arbitration. The nonjusticiable disputes to conciliation. From time to time this international league shall meet for the purpose of working out a code of procedure and to make international law.

That each of the member nations shall obligate itself to submit justiciable disputes to arbitration, and nonjusticiable disputes to conciliation.

That all member nations shall obligate themselves to punish any nation which shall refuse to submit a dispute either for arbitration or conciliation, as the case may require.

That the nations shall use their joint military and naval forces to punish the recalcitrant nation.

That is Mr. Taft's proposition. You will notice the distinction between justiciable and nonjusticiable disputes. He proceeds upon the theory that there are certain things that no nation can afford to permit other nations to question, and so far as that class of questions is concerned he would not have any nation submit to international authority. He would reserve the right to go to war in some cases.

It is evident that so far as the internal life of a nation is concerned no outside nation has any power to intervene or interfere, but whatever affects the intercourse or contact between nation and nation becomes a matter of international concern. It should be the very object and the very reason for the existence of such a league to assure to each nation full scope to live its own life unmolested.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Would you consider the question of duties upon imports as a question of international concern?

Mr. LONDON. Personally, in order to make my position clear, I want to say that I am a free trader. I believe in free trade among nations. Protective tariffs and punitive tariffs are barriers among the nations of the world. I would see international free trade. Just as we have free trade between the Pacific and Atlantic coasts of the United States, and just as

this country has benefited by the abolition of tariff walls among the 48 States, just as free trade between the States has resulted in mutual benefit to the entire Union, just so would, in my opinion, the entire world be benefited by the abolition of tariffs. It is certainly in the interest of the nations to take up the question of tariffs. All reciprocity treaties and the "favored-nation" clause in present treaties are steps in the direction of uniformity in the commercial relations of nations.

I have dwelt so much on Mr. Taft's plan, which is, by the way, indorsed by a number of statesmen abroad, because it emphasizes the necessity of international cooperation, and not because I am in full agreement with his proposition.

The artificial theory that questions of national honor may be involved which can not be submitted to the judgment of the world, and that such questions are not judicable, is one of the most dangerous and prolific causes of conflict. Whenever there is a selfish design to be accomplished, it is usually covered up by the veil of national honor. I discussed this subject at length in one of my speeches delivered during the Sixty-fourth Congress.

The Taft plan fails to emphasize the necessity of disarmament, and as long as the nations maintain large armies and navies all treaties will be scraps of paper. As long as it will be within the power of any government to set in motion millions of armed men against any people, there will be "war and rumors of war." For the last three years the world has been trying to regain its balance and to offset the effect of the vicious blow inflicted during the first two months of the war by a powerful military machine. One of the principal objects of international cooperation must be to do away with armaments and militarism.

The present revolutionary Government of Russia in presenting its terms for universal peace demands that "peace conditions (are) to be settled by a peace congress composed of delegates chosen by national, representative bodies; diplomats to bind themselves to sign no secret treaties, which are to be declared, by their nature, null and void" and "gradual disarmament on land and sea, and the reestablishment of militia to replace standing armies." I shall take up later their other demands.

Unfortunately, while the President of the United States has again and again urged the need of permanent international institutions to guarantee lasting peace and to reduce to the minimum the evil of armaments, the people of the United States and most of their representatives look upon these suggestions as a beautiful sentiment, a dream, which it will do no harm to indulge in, and not as a concrete, definite, and practical remedy for war.

The people fail to grasp the fact that when the President speaks of Alsace-Lorraine, of Belgium, and Serbia, and Roumania, of the readjustment of the frontiers of Italy, he speaks of world purposes and world problems; that while no treaties have been entered into, binding the United States as an ally, the old policy of isolation has been abandoned. America is in the midst of it. If the United States is not to initiate the organization of a world league to assure peace, who will? There is too much bitterness, too much hatred, there has been too much suffering on the other side of the Atlantic. They have seen too much blood.

An international congress, for the present to consist, of course, of the representatives of the parliaments of the allied countries—associates in the war—only, should be convoked without delay. With the President of the United States as the presiding officer, the conference would undertake the task of eliminating selfish national designs and of presenting the basic principles, the acceptance of which would entitle a nation to membership in a league of democratic nations.

I have promised to return to the demands of the Bolsheviks. The word "bolshevik" is a newly coined Russian word. The Bolsheviks represent one of the two factions of the Social Democratic Party of Russia, and owe their name to the fact that at a certain party conference they were in a majority. Were we to create a corresponding English word, we would use the word "majoritists." Two groups outside of the social democrats are respectively designated by two words of Latin origin—Maximalists and Minimalists. Here are their demands, published in the New York World, by the way, the only paper, I think, that did publish them, with the exception of the New York Evening Post; so that most of the American people who read other papers are still under the impression that the international aims of the Bolsheviks represent an emanation from a lunatic asylum. Here are their demands:

- (1) The evacuation of all Russian territory occupied by Germany, and autonomy for Poland and the Lithuanian and Lettish Provinces.
- (2) Autonomy for Turkish Armenia.
- (3) Settlement of the question of Alsace-Lorraine by plebiscite, with a guarantee of perfect freedom of vote.

A substantial group of the French Socialists take the same attitude. The refusal of the French Socialists to be repre-

sented in the last two cabinets is attributable to their moderation in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine. The British Socialists also favor a referendum. My resolution of December 6, 1915, contained a similar provision.

(4) The restoration of Belgium and indemnity for damages to be provided by an international financial fund.

(5) The restoration of Serbia and Montenegro, with indemnity for damages to be taken out of a similar international fund. Serbia, moreover, to have access to the Adriatic; Bosnia and Herzegovina to have complete autonomy.

(6) Other contested territory in the Balkans to enjoy temporary autonomy until a plebiscite is taken.

(7) Roumania to recover all territory within her previous frontiers, after promising to grant autonomy to the Dobruja and to give effect to article 3 of the Berlin convention concerning the equality of the rights of Jews—

Roumania still being the only country in the world that follows the medieval policy of denying to the Jewish people the rights accorded to people of every other faith.

Here the principle of religious toleration is considered too elementary to require restatement.

(8) Autonomy for the regions Trent and Trieste, inhabited by Italian populations, until a plebiscite is taken.

(9) Germany to receive back her colonies.

The colonies of Germany have a population of only 12,000,000 souls. The question of their possession does not justify the sacrifice of a single life.

(10) Restoration of Persia and Greece.

AGAINST U-BOAT WAR.

(11) Neutralization of all maritime straits leading to inland seas, including the canals of Suez and Panama; freedom of commercial navigation; the canceling of all charters during war time of enemy ships, and the torpedoing of commercial ships on the high seas to be forbidden by international agreement.

(12) All belligerents to renounce war indemnities under any form or disguise, and all contributions exacted since the beginning of the war to be refunded.

(13) All belligerents to renounce definitely any commercial boycott after the war or the institution of special customs and agreements—

And the two demands I previously referred to—

(14) Peace conditions to be settled by a peace congress composed of delegates chosen by national representative bodies; diplomats to bind themselves to sign no secret treaties, which are to be declared, by their nature, null and void.

(15) Gradual disarmament on land and sea, and the reestablishment of militia to replace standing armies.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman please give the date when that appeared in that paper?

Mr. LONDON. It appeared on the 2d of January, 1918. I cut it from the New York Evening Post, which in a headline says, "The following cable dispatch was printed yesterday in the World."

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That was before the President's message?

Mr. LONDON. Oh, yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. And before Lloyd George's speech.

Mr. LONDON. Yes; before the President's message.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I will say that I have looked the papers over very carefully, and this is the first intimation I have had that there had been any such thing printed anywhere.

Mr. LONDON. It was printed in the New York World and in the New York Evening Post.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman give his idea as to how the Russian terms correspond with the terms of peace enunciated by the President in his recent address to Congress?

Mr. LONDON. I have compared them, and it appears to me that most of the terms are identical with the terms enunciated by the President. There are 15 conditions in the Russian statement. One of them is that reparation to Belgium should be at the expense of an international fund, while, so far as I can recall, the President's proposed terms omitted any reference to indemnity for damages, unless the word "restoration," which he uses after "evacuation," means that.

Oh, I can imagine that if these terms had been published before the President's message and had been read from a platform in Mississippi or Kentucky or Kalamazoo by a man who happened to be a Socialist, it would probably have brought him to a lamp-post, with the encouragement of a part of our press.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. To what does the gentleman attribute the fact that the newspapers have almost unanimously suppressed that news?

Mr. LONDON. So far as the newspapers are concerned, I said on a previous occasion, that the man who invented movable type had a just right to consider himself a benefactor of humanity; but the question is, Who does the writing? If we had a press that represented the honest opinion of the men who wrote, whether what they wrote was right or wrong, that would be a contribution to the making of thought; but when you have a newspaper which takes the most brilliant mind and enslaves it

and makes a man write things, not that his soul and heart dictate, but the things that he is paid to write, we have the worst form of prostitution, worse than the social evil. [Applause.] The great problem for democracy, using that word in the broadest sense, is how to get an honest press, how to get the people to hear the word of truth or of error honestly, independently, and courageously spoken.

Mr. PLATT. Was not a synopsis of those terms published in a great many newspapers? I am sure I read them, and I do not think I read them in either the *World* or the *Evening Post*.

Mr. LONDON. That may be; but the fact is that the men who prepared these demands were being denounced as the most dangerous lunatics that had escaped from an asylum.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman recall the lurid stories of the arrival on the Pacific coast at San Francisco of a vessel supposed to be Russian, the command of which was said to have been taken away from the captain by a committee of three or four, and which was the subject of much investigation for several days?

Mr. LONDON. Oh, the newspaper people will be making up stories if they have not got anything that is really new. A good newspaper man must have some imagination or he would not have the courage to live. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It was said of that vessel that it came as a part of the Bolshevik movement to fraternize with the I. W. W. in the United States, and it was also said, with considerable dramatic effect, that a stack of 150 arms had been found on the vessel by which the I. W. W. was to revolutionize the world.

Mr. LONDON. Yes; and I saw the report of a collection having been taken up at one of these meetings in which they collected \$2.11 to revolutionize the world. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And about a week after it appeared somewhere at the bottom of a newspaper column that the vessel had been discharged, the customs officials having declared that there was nothing wrong with the cargo or crew.

Mr. LONDON. If that was the worst thing about the press it would not be as black as it is.

Half of the time we can not find out what is going on. It is unfortunate that we do not get German newspapers and publications in the United States; it has been impossible to obtain in the Congressional Library contemporary German publications since March, 1916. I think I am correct in that statement. We do not know what is going on there. To us it is just as important to know the morale of the German people, to know what their opinions are, what they say, and what they are being permitted or prohibited to say, as it is to know the number of their regiments. This war will be won or lost by the morale of the peoples. It is a world war; it is not a war of armies. It is a war of the people, and we are entitled to know what the German people are saying, what they think they are fighting for.

As a matter of fact, German efficiency is largely a bugaboo. Once in a while we get, in a social democratic paper published in the German language in New York City, extracts of articles from Swiss or Norwegian papers; once in a while an extract of a speech delivered in the Reichstag. Less than four weeks ago we read that the German Socialist paper—the *Vorwaerts*—reported that 40,000,000 people were starving in Germany. The report of the various committees who investigated the conditions of the occupied Polish Provinces now in possession of Germany disclose a state of affairs which is almost unbelievable—that infants under the age of 5 have almost disappeared; that children are being brought with swollen stomachs into the hospitals, swollen because of hunger; and that tuberculosis is increasing because of starvation. Evidently the so-called efficiency means taking away everything from the civil population and giving it to the army. The incessant babbling about German efficiency is calculated to arouse the spirit of the savage and of the pugilist, a spirit which is aroused when you are told that the other fellow is getting the better of you.

If we but knew how much they suffer, if we but knew that the Imperial Government has been compelled to change chancellor after chancellor at the demand of the social democrats; if we knew that it was compelled to permit peace meetings; if we knew that all over the cities of Germany they have peace demonstrations, we would know that the enemy has reached the limit of his power and is about to yield and will be compelled to yield. [Applause.] British labor has been speaking boldly and openly. I have before me the report of a speech made in London in December, 1917, by J. H. Thomas, member of Parliament, as copied for me from the *Daily Post*, of London, England.

Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Moon). The gentleman has 11 minutes.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may proceed until he concludes his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may proceed until he concludes his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONDON. Now, here is what this British member of parliament says. After reciting that the country was near an industrial revolution in 1914, after speaking of the patriotic response made by British labor to the appeal of the Government, the paper reports him as saying:

He was sorry to think how much better it would be for us to-day if we were satisfied in our minds that the same principle, the same feelings, and the same enthusiasm that carried us through the critical months of 1914 was the spirit that is assisting us now. It was not; and no good purpose was to be served by blinding ourselves to that fact.

What was the cause of what he would call this loss of morale? In the first place, he believed that all the governments since the war began had failed to take the public sufficiently into their confidence.

During all these years we had never been told the truth, the real truth, of the situation and now we had reached the stage when, unfortunately, they did not believe the word of their statesmen.

People have begun to speak boldly everywhere. I suppose these are some of the voices to which the President referred in his last message and in his message before the last. Somebody somewhere ought to have the courage to raise his voice without being accused of disloyalty, without his devotion to the country being questioned. How can there be any American who will be disloyal to America? How can there be any citizen of the United States who will not wish good to this land? Why should a man be silenced because he has an opinion to express, a story to tell, a message to deliver, a thought to suggest? [Applause.] I am a Socialist. I have been treated fairly by you; I have no complaint to make; but once in a while I do feel like throwing something at the demagogue who dares impeach the loyalty of the Socialists of the United States.

The speaker, continuing, says:

There have been too many ambiguous phrases as to what we are fighting for. The people would be ready for any sacrifice in order to crush the spirit of militarism; but if we are to remain a people united against the dangers that confront us we must be told in clear and simple terms what are our aims.

When the President came in to deliver his last message I instinctively applauded him. As a rule I do not do that, but, somehow or other, I felt that an advance was about to be made, that a step forward was about to be taken. A clear statement of the objects of the war, even if that statement should contain things which appear to be irreconcilable, is of incalculable benefit to the human race. [Applause.] Let the central powers and the democratic elements throughout the world say, "What is there in that statement of demands, what are the things that we are going to continue to fight for?"

Is there any man in the world who wants to question the right of Belgium to be restored to herself? Is there any man in the world who wants to dispute the right of the smaller nations like Serbia and Montenegro to belong to themselves? If the central powers have the courage to dispute it, let them do so, and they will have the whole world fighting until the Government of Germany is destroyed. No declaration can be taken as the final word. But an unequivocal statement of objects brings things to an issue. The world is then called upon to approve or disapprove, to accept or reject a clearly stated proposition. One thing is quite certain, and that is that the masses are beginning to be heard from. They are taking courage to say what is in their minds and in their hearts. They do not take anything for granted, they are analyzing and studying.

And if they go back to the beginning of this great world contest, here and there a number of men will be found who will discover that the guilt was not all on one side. One of the things that makes me sick at heart is the constant use of the word "Hun." The sinking of the *Lusitania* was an act of barbarism that will never be forgiven as long as mankind exists. [Applause.] The sinking by torpedoes of commercial and hospital ships is barbarous, and is a reversion to the stage of savagery; but when you speak of an entire people as a Hun people, you do injustice to yourself and to your sense of intelligence.

What was the situation? Here we had a people reaching unity in 1871, building an empire, out of a number of small principalities. Can we ask that they shall break up again into principalities, that they should cease to be one? No. They had a large army, an efficient army. So did their immediate neighbors. Here you have a people 70,000,000 strong, just realizing the value of being a united people. In the Provinces they have

a feudal system of government, and are not democratic. As an American professor described the German Government, it is not a government of the people, it is not a government by the people, but it is an attempt to be a government for the people. Every nation has its own psychology, its own institutions.

The Germans are competing with the rest of the world in commerce, in industry, and in science. They are not by any means the greatest people upon earth, but they are a great people. What are the colonies of Germany?

The colonies of Germany contain a population of 12,000,000 souls. What are the colonies of the other countries? France, with a population of thirty-eight or forty million souls, has colonies with 44,000,000 population. Great Britain, with a population of 45,000,000, has colonies with a population of 376,000,000 souls. Of these 376,000,000 souls there are only 18,000,000 who occupy colonies with democratic institutions—in reality, republics, like the Dominion of Canada, Australia, Labrador, South Africa. The claim can not honestly be made that any one of these countries has been in the recent past less imperialistic than the other.

All of them have maintained armies and navies. It is true that naval power is not half as dangerous as military power, as a continental army. Let us assume that the British naval power has been used and will be used in the future solely for defensive purposes, as fleets are not effective for aggression, while a continental army is a serious danger to every neighbor. The presence of a large army in Germany compelled the maintenance of a large army in France, forcing France into the embrace of Russia. This war has been the nightmare of France since 1871.

One can not indict history. No man is all he wants to be. No nation can be all it would like to be. It is the Socialist theory that the principal cause of modern wars has been economic rivalry. I shall quote to you a conservative authority in support of that theory.

The Encyclopædia Britannica in its article on Europe reveals with scientific precision the clash of colonial ambitions of the European powers. It says:

The conflicting desires of several of the powers to obtain colonial possessions in various parts of the world and to forestall their competitors in the act of taking possession were bound to introduce complications in which England, as the greatest of colonial powers, would generally be involved; and as the unappropriated portions of the earth's surface at the beginning of the period under discussion were to be found chiefly in Africa, it was in the Dark Continent that the conflicts of interests mostly took place. England's chief competitors were France and Germany. Her traditional policy, except in the south of the continent, where the conditions of soil and climate were favorable to European colonists, had been purely commercial. She had refrained from annexation of territory as involving too much expenditure and responsibility, and confined her protection to the trading stations on the coast. When France came into the field this policy had to be abandoned. The policy of France was also commercial in a certain sense, but the methods she adopted were very different. She endeavored to bring under her authority, by annexation or the establishment of protectorates, the largest possible extent of territory, in order to increase her trade by a system of differential tariffs; she encroached on the hinterland of British settlements, and endeavored to direct artificially the native inland trade toward her own ports. A glance at the map of the African west coast will suffice to show the success with which this policy was carried out. When the British Government awoke to the danger, all that could be done was to prevent further encroachments by likewise annexing territory.

So that annexation and desire for annexation was not the vice of any particular nation.

To say that none of these nations had been preparing for this contest would also be a historical falsehood, but I am not going to take advantage of the kindness of the House to go into that. You can all more or less readily ascertain the facts. Bernhardi pointed out in his book, published in 1911, Germany and the Next War, that the strategic Russian roads would be completed in 1915. He predicted that it would be impossible to rely upon Italy because Italian national ambitions conflicted with her being loyal to the central powers. Incidentally, it was he who predicted the value of the submarine as a fighting machine. On the other hand, it appears from an official report, laid before the House of Commons on July 22, 1912, by the First Lord of the Admiralty—you will find it in the Britannica Yearbook of 1913—that Great Britain was officially warned of the menacing growth of the German fleet. In short, this war was not an accident. The selfish and the unselfish, the noble and the ignoble, the highest in men and the meanest combine in war. That is applicable as to individuals as well as to nations. The appeal of Belgium is an appeal to the whole world. The protest against its invasion was a protest to the conscience of the whole world. The protest against the attack upon Serbia is a protest to the world.

When Serbia was attacked by Austria, who moved against Austria? England? No; Russia. Why Russia and not England? Because Constantinople was involved. Belgium was attacked. Who took up the cause? England. Why England? Because English interests—I am not speaking in reproach but

as a student of history—English vital interests were in danger. England allowed July to pass, part of August to pass, before it declared war against Austria. The crime against Serbia was surely not less infamous than that against Belgium. Each of them was entitled to the protection of the world.

It is the misunderstanding of the causes of the war and of its aims and objects that has led to the present state of distress in Russia, the land of martyrdom. Kerensky had on six or seven different occasions promised that he would obtain a clear and definite statement of the objects of the war so that the Russian people would not be asked to shed their blood in vain. That statement was not forthcoming. They all loved him, they respected him. He represented no faction, no narrow group, but on six or seven occasions he deceived the people by promising them a clear statement of the objects of the war, and instead of a clear statement there was an outpouring of polysyllables from the inexhaustible English vocabulary. You can not feed people with words all the time. Here is what the President said in December—

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Before the gentleman takes up that subject. Who does the gentleman mean by the term "people of Russia"? Who was it Kerensky deceived?

Mr. LONDON. I do not say he deceived them, he certainly did not deceive them intentionally. I should have used the word "disappointed." I mean by the people of Russia the man who tills the soil; the man who walks behind the plow; the man who is called upon to sacrifice his life by fighting; I mean by the people of Russia the illiterate, the poor, and the ignorant as well as the intellectual, the peasants as well as the big land-owners who speak a little French and are cultured. I mean by the people of Russia those who have lived there and have been suffering there all their lives. It is the people of Russia in whose behalf the President of the United States has made a warm and noble appeal in his last message delivered to the American Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. If the gentleman will yield for another inquiry. Does the gentleman mean the people of Russia are those who are now working for Germany and the Kaiser?

Mr. LONDON. Oh, but the President has disposed of that.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Who has?

Mr. LONDON. The President of the United States has disposed of that.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. He may have for the gentleman from New York but not for anybody else of whom I know.

Mr. LONDON. I hope the gentleman from Minnesota does not assume to speak for the entire American people? [Applause.]

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. It is quite certain I voice the sentiment of the American people a heap sight better than the gentleman from New York who is now on his feet and addressing the House.

Mr. LONDON. I guess I better disregard the gentleman from Minnesota. I am dealing with big things.

How many years did it take the United States, the little Republic of 3,000,000 souls, to establish a stable form of government? You had the Whiskey Rebellion. You had the confederation struggling for years to establish a government. You had constitutional conventions composed of the best minds of America, who many times gave up the hope of framing a constitution. And after all, the builders of the Constitution had to compromise with slavery, knowing well that some day it would lead to civil war. You can not take 180,000,000 people and organize them in a day. It is only the selfish and the unthinking who would condemn 180,000,000 people who have struggled for centuries and have finally overthrown an autocratic form of government. The rest of the world sympathizes with that long-suffering people. [Applause.]

Had the allies made a definite declaration five or six months ago Russia would have been saved to them to-day. And even to-day Russia exhausted, bleeding at every pore, starving Russia, repudiates a selfish peace and pleads for the peace of the world. [Applause.]

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. No; I do not like the tone of the gentleman, who attempts to speak as the father confessor for the American people.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. How much time has the gentleman received in the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has spoken one hour exactly.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. How much more time has the gentleman?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As much as he needs.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman was extended the privilege—

Mr. LONDON. I did not want to be offensive. If I was, I am sorry.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman from New York was never sorry for anything in his life.

Mr. LONDON. I am always sorry if I happen to do a wrong, and I am always man enough to attempt to correct it.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman now yield for an inquiry?

Mr. LONDON. A relevant inquiry.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Does the gentleman approve of the efforts on the part of the present Russian Government to make a separate peace with Germany?

Mr. LONDON. What nonsense. Why should the gentleman ask that question when he knows that I sent a cablegram to the president of the Soldiers and Workmen's Council in April of last year suggesting that a separate peace was a danger to Russia and a danger to the world? I sent that message, getting myself into trouble with the pacifists, who instead of possessing the idea of peace is possessed by that idea. Why should the gentleman ask me that question?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I repeat it.

Mr. LONDON. I have just praised Russia's effort to bring about universal peace. Is it not a condemnation of the theory of a separate peace?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman is opposed to the present movement?

Mr. LONDON. I deny there is a present movement for a separate peace. On the contrary, these men are to-day speaking for universal peace. But one should have patience with a people who are in the agony of a revolution and of war. Men are abnormal in time of war. How much more difficult is it to be normal when war is added to revolution.

Mr. PLATT. May I suggest that anybody who reads John Fiske's Critical Period of American History will find that we were in very much the same state, not in all respects, of course, but almost as hopeless, in founding a stable government.

Mr. LONDON. I have read a number of works on that period of American history. I have in my bedroom a volume on the French Revolution, and when things look very dark in Russia I take up one of those volumes and find how much better things are in Russia. For one thing, the guillotine is not busy.

All I want is to urge the necessity of taking up for discussion the basic principles upon which a permanent peace can be established for the world and by the world. I am an opponent of anarchy. I hate disorder. I detest with every fiber of my being the abuse of physical force and the taking advantage of the weak by the strong. I detest it in industry when it takes little children and exploits their helplessness for profit. I detest oppression. I am for order. I stand for order and for peaceful methods. I love America not because it is the best that can be given to mankind, but because of the opportunity it affords to fight for better things, and so long as that opportunity exists we will have better things.

Democracy does not guarantee to be wise; democracy does not guarantee to be always just; but it is always wiser and always more just than the little groups who speak in the name of the peoples. I stand for order in the relation of each man to his nation and of each citizen to the government to which he owes loyalty and of each nation to the rest of the world. That is why I advocate the necessity of international order instead of international chaos, international destruction, and international anarchy. I thank you, gentlemen. [Applause.]

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to proceed for 30 minutes, to reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Moon). The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for 30 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] a question in the utmost good faith. It will take only a moment if the gentleman from Illinois will kindly withhold.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] will give me his attention, I would like to ask him a question before he takes his seat.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that the gentleman has yielded the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point is well taken.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I ask the gentleman from Illinois to yield to me for one minute in which to ask the gentleman from New York a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota asks leave to proceed for one minute. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes; pending my request for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] and that of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. My question is this: Which nation mobilized her troops first and started this war?

Mr. LONDON. The cause of this war, if the gentleman please, was the attack by Austria-Hungary upon Serbia.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I confess that. I agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. LONDON. And there is no doubt but that Austria-Hungary would not have taken that step unless it had been supported by the Kaiser and his crowd.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I agree with that. Who mobilized his troops first?

Mr. LONDON. It is not a question of who mobilized first, but who was responsible for the mobilization.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I wish the gentleman would answer that question.

Mr. LONDON. I take it for granted that the first to mobilize was Austria-Hungary.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. No; Russia.

Mr. LONDON. I mean against Serbia.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes; of course.

Mr. LONDON. The spark that started the conflagration came from Austria-Hungary.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Does not the gentleman think that the quickest and only way to get a peace for democracy is to—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] is recognized.

PROMOTION OF EXPORT TRADE.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 2316, known as the export bill, with Senate amendments thereto, be taken from the Speaker's table, that the Senate amendments be disagreed to and the conference agreed to, as asked for by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the House bill 2316, to promote export trade, and for other purposes, be taken from the Speaker's table, the Senate amendments disagreed to, and the conference asked by the Senate agreed to. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2316) to promote export trade, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the bill be taken from the Speaker's table and the conference agreed to, as asked for by the Senate.

Mr. WEBB. Yes; I ask that the bill be taken from the Speaker's table and a conference agreed to, as asked for by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair appoints as conferees on the part of the House Mr. WEBB, Mr. CARLIN, and Mr. VOLSTEAD.

DECLINING AMERICAN BIRTH RATE.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the Record an address by Louis I. Dublin, statistician of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., delivered before the American Association for the Advancement of Science on December 29, 1917, concerning the decline of the American birth rate. It is an interesting document which should not be allowed to die.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by inserting the address referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The following is the address referred to:

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DECLINING BIRTH RATE.

[Address of retiring vice president, Section I. Social and Economic Science, American Association for Advancement of Science, Pittsburgh, Dec. 29, 1917, by Louis I. Dublin, statistician, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.]

It is a custom of this section, I believe, for the retiring vice president to select for his address a subject of national interest in the field of social economy. He is expected to avoid narrow and technical discussion of specialties, but he may properly summarize the important works of other investigators in specialized fields to show their trend and bearing, and he may also point out the direction which further research should take. These requirements of the occasion are all the more necessary now, in view of the circumstances under which we are living. We are going through a period of serious conflict. Our Nation is at present engaged in concentrating its resources of men, of materials, and, above all, of thought to make itself felt in the world struggle for preserving civilization. This is no time for trivialities or for small detail. Under these conditions the Section on Social and Economic Science of the American Association may be expected to have a message of national import. It would be almost common to take your time and attention for anything but a topic of the widest practical significance in the present national emergency.

With these considerations in mind, I have chosen as the subject of this address the significance of our declining birth rate. I have done so with considerable hesitancy, because of the difficulty of the subject and the importance of its present lesson. I shall count also on your forbearance, hoping that you will forgive the incompleteness and sketchy character of my argument. The study of American demography has convinced me that we are concerned with a problem of the greatest possible moment. Changes have been progressing in the internal structure of our population which have, for the most part, escaped attention and which, if allowed to continue, will result in very serious national embarrassment. Conditions of war bring into relief the necessity for a vigorous and efficient population. It is not too much to say that the present tendencies in our national and family life are such as seriously threaten the development of those groups in the population on which we must rely for vigor and efficiency in thought and action.

The declining birth rate has received but little scientific attention in the United States. It has been, however, the subject of very careful investigation in Europe. During the last 50 years the birth rate has declined in virtually every country of the civilized world. Some countries have been affected more than others, but the phenomenon has been observed in extreme form in one country, namely, France. France has made an experiment in birth control on a national scale. All the parts of that experiment, including the end result, are now on view and available for scientific observation and comment. Before the present war France had already reached a point where her birth rate had decreased to a point below her death rate; her population was actually decreasing. But for 10 years before that time the approaching crisis had called for the careful attention of her best minds.

A commission on depopulation, composed of statesmen and sociologists, was appointed to study the problem, and a comprehensive report on the sources of depopulation was prepared. This report is too elaborate for detailed description here. I shall rather present the situation for France, as I understand it, in broad outline, bringing into relief only the main findings of the commission.

Let us consider the growth of population during the last century in the three leading countries of western Europe, namely, France, the United Kingdom, and the States composing the German Empire. At the beginning of the nineteenth century France was the leader of the three countries, with a population of about 29,000,000. The States which now compose the German Empire were second, with a population of about 23,000,000, and the United Kingdom stood third, with a population of about 18,000,000. A century later we find the situation totally changed. The German Empire headed the list with a population of nearly 65,000,000; the United Kingdom was second, with a population of 45,000,000; and France was third, with a population of only 39,000,000. In other words, while the population of the German Empire had nearly trebled and the United Kingdom had increased to two and one-half times its earlier numbers, the population of France had increased less than one-half. Further inspection of the figures show that a marked change in the rate of increase of the population of France occurred about the year 1860. At that time France was still in the lead and had already reached a population of 37,000,000. After that date it increased only 2,000,000, while Germany in the same period almost doubled in population. In 1811 the population of France constituted 16 per cent of all Europe. One hundred years later the French population constituted only 9 per cent of the total.

This situation for France may be accounted for principally in terms of its declining birth rate. Such figures as I have for France show that at about 1830 the rate was 30 births per 1,000 of population. The last available figure for 1914 was 18 per 1,000; the death rate was 19.6 per 1,000. This was the first war year, but already in 1911 the death rate, 19.6, exceeded the birth rate, 18.7. The reduction of more than one-third in the birth rate during the 80 years was both gradual and continuous. On the other hand, the birth rates in the German Empire and in the United Kingdom continued high, over 30 per 1,000 up to 1895 in the latter and up to 1909 in the former. Since then the birth rates have declined rapidly in both countries, but the enormous increase in population for both Germany and the United Kingdom were achieved before the changes in the birth rate began to make themselves seriously felt.

We are not concerned entirely with gross totals of population. Equally significant is the internal structure of population. As we shall see later, changes in the constitution of a population almost invariably appear with changes in the birth rate. This will become clearer by comparing the ages below which one-quarter, one-half, and three-quarters of the total populations of Germany, of England and Wales, and of France, respectively, are found. Thus, one-quarter of the population of Germany is under age 11, one-quarter of the population of England and Wales is under 12 years of age, whereas one-quarter of the French population is under age 14 years. Again, one-half of the population of Germany is found under 23.5 years, one-half of the population of England and Wales is below 26 years, while one-half of the French population is below age 30. We find, finally, that three-quarters of the population of Germany is below age 41 years, of England and Wales is below 42 years, and of France is below 49 years. These figures show clearly that the average age of the French population is considerably higher than that of the other two countries. Its youth and its strength form a smaller part of its total population, while its old and its dependents form a much larger part. This, we shall find, is an

invariable consequence of a decreasing birth rate, which reduces the proportion of the young and thus brings into relief an undue proportion of the aged.

The declining national birth rate of France is also severely selective in character. The reduction of the birth rate has affected mostly those who are both economically and socially best fitted to bear and to raise a family to maturity. A careful classification by Bertillon of the number of children per 100 families in Paris shows that the very poor have the largest number and the very rich the smallest number of children. The order of size of the family is invariably the reverse of the order of economic condition. Since economic status is highly associated with efficiency and social worth, low birth rates in the best equipped groups of the population can have but one effect on the vital constitution of the next generation, namely, a decline in constructive effort for national development.

Evidence suggestive of such decline in national development is afforded by the fact that coincident with a rapidly declining birth rate France has had a high and rather stationary death rate during the last quarter of a century. England, through the development of its public-health service, reduced its death rate to under 14 per 1,000 in the year before the war (1913), when France had a death rate of 4 per 1,000 higher. In spite of the low French birth rate, the infant mortality rate has not been low and has been coupled with a high still-birth rate. The death rate from tuberculosis in France has recently come into public notice here because of war conditions, but it was high before the war. The acute infectious diseases, including typhoid fever, which have so readily lent themselves to control in other European countries and in the United States, show unsatisfactory death rates for France. In fact, we find in this country, side by side with a low rate of reproduction, evidence of indifference to the conservation of the valuable lives that are born. A disturbing element in the French situation to-day is the lack of a national public-health program. Is it not possible that such conditions follow directly from the absence in the community of those earnest and able men who everywhere further progress along social and economical lines? These leaders of the nation are absent because they were not born. It would seem from the facts that where the psychology of a people permits depopulation to go on for a long period unchecked other evil tendencies of national life appear, such as indifference to the obligation of maintaining high standards of public health.

It is painful to say these things at this time, and I should refrain from referring to them were it not for the necessity of emphasizing the facts which so directly affect our own American population problems.

The experience of England has been much less acute, although the tendency of the most recent years has been fully as disturbing as that in France during the previous decade. In the 5-year period between 1871 and 1875 the birth rate was 35.5 per 1,000 of population. In the period 1911 to 1914, inclusive, the birth rate was only 24 per 1,000. The reduction in the birth rate in England has been accompanied, to be sure, with a very healthy decline in the death rate. In the forty-odd years since 1871 this has decreased from 22 to less than 14 per 1,000; whereas the decreasing birth rate in France did not accompany any appreciable reduction in the death rate. The rate of natural increase has, however, declined in England from 13.5 in the period 1871 to 1875 to 10.1 per 1,000 in the period 1911 to 1914. England was still increasing in population at the rate of 1 per cent annually before the war. The reduction in the rate of natural increase and certain internal changes in structure of population had, however, become a source of apprehension to English statesmen, and a commission of qualified experts was appointed to study and report on the problem. Their findings have been available for some time and may be summarized as follows:

The birth rate has declined to the extent of approximately one-third during the last 35 years.

This decline has not been due to any large extent to a decline in the marriage rate or to a rise in the mean age at marriage or to other causes diminishing the proportion of married women of fertile age in the population. The decline has been due rather to a conscious limitation of fertility in the large mass of the population.

The decline in the birth rate, although general, has not been uniformly distributed over all sections of the community. It has affected primarily those economic and social groups which, as we have shown for France, are best able to bear and maintain a good-sized family. Thus we find that the number of legitimate births per 1,000 married males under 55 years in England and Wales was 119 for the upper and middle classes and 213 for the unskilled workmen, with a maximum of 230 among the miners. The birth rate is greater as the economic and social status is lower.

Internal changes of population are taking place in England very similar to those observed in France. Under the influence of the decreasing birth rate the average age of the population of England and Wales is rising and the proportion of old persons is, of course, correspondingly increasing. If we keep in mind also that the mortality rates of females at the adult ages are progressively lower than those for males we are not surprised to find that the increasing proportion of old people is greater among females than among males. While there were, for example, 119 females per 100 males in 1871 at the ages 65 and over, the number in 1911 had become 132. The disturbing element in this picture is that the population is growing older not only through the increased longevity of its constituents but more especially through the decreasing reinforcement from its youth, and, due to the operation of mortality, that there is a progressive excess of females over males at the older ages. The situation in England may be summed up in the words of her leading demographer, Sir J. Athelstane Baines, as follows: "In the last 40 years the proportion of people of an age to marry has materially increased, but they marry less and later in life, and thus, to some extent, cause a reduction in the number of births. The main cause of the falling birth rate, however, is the decline in the fertility of the married due to the voluntary restriction of childbearing, a decline which has been especially rapid since the beginning of the century. The effects of the fall in the birth rate have been neutralized, until within the last few years, by a still greater fall in the death rate. The improvement has not been so marked amongst the very young and the old as at adolescence and in the prime of life. While, therefore, the rate of natural increase has diminished less than the fall in the birth rate would indicate, it has been maintained at the expense of the young."

"As the proportion of infants with a high mortality decreased, that of the ages of low mortality increased. The death rate went down, and the balance of population became economically favorable. But as the supply of infants diminishes relatively to the rest of the community, and their elders pass from their prime into the time of life when mortality is heavy, the proportionate supply of potential parents of the most prolific ages tends to decrease, the birth rate falls more

rapidly, and the death rate begins to rise, leaving the margin of natural increase alarmingly narrow. The result is an older and less vigorous people, and, as the vitality of women is greater than that of men, more of the former sex reach maturity, and they last longer, so that a relatively small and probably wholesome numerical superiority at the working ages is converted into a growing preponderance of old women in the vale of life.

I shall now present the situation for the United States. Superficially the facts of American population growth present a very favorable picture. Each successive census has shown a marked increase in our total population over the preceding one; that for 1910 showed an increase of nearly 16,000,000 lives over 1900, or 21 per cent. Such data as we have for births and deaths indicate a similar situation. Our birth rate is probably about 25 per 1,000, and the death rate for the entire country not far from 15 per 1,000. The difference between the birth rate and the death rate, the rate of natural increase, is about 10 per 1,000, or 1 per cent annually. The rate is much the same as we found for England and Wales in the year before the war. No one should find fault with a rate of natural increase of 1 per cent per year. The population problem of France would be considered on a fair way to solution if that country could maintain for a period of years a rate corresponding to even one-half of that which we now enjoy in the United States.

The difficulty with our American situation is that we have been satisfied with a gross showing. We have not looked underneath the surface to observe the varying tendency in the several groups of the population and in the several sections of the country. The marked increase in our total population is in large measure the result of two factors, (1) immigration and (2) a high rate of increase in the foreign born rather than in our native stock. This is shown by the constantly decreasing proportion which the native whites of native parentage form of the total white population. In 1870, for example, this group formed 67.8 per cent of the total white population in the United States, while in 1910 it had decreased to 60.5 per cent. The proportion of the foreign stock correspondingly increased during these 40 years. These figures are accentuated if we turn to certain areas of the country. Thus, in the New England States the proportion of the native white stock decreased from 52.3 per cent of the total white population in 1890 to 40.3 per cent in 1910. In the Middle Atlantic States the native white stock decreased from 51.8 in 1890 to 44.8 in 1910. In these important areas the native stock is playing an ever smaller part in the composition of the total population. In fact, a very definite tendency toward depopulation has already fastened itself upon a large part of the native stock of the country.

There has been a marked and continuous reduction in the birth rate in the United States for a period of years. In the absence of comprehensive birth statistics, such as are available for European countries, we must turn to other sources which are clearly indicative of the changes which have occurred in the birth rate. We may use, for example, the number of children under 5 per thousand women in the child-bearing ages, namely, 15 to 44 years, inclusive.

Prof. Willcox in a recent paper has shown that this proportion has decreased about 50 per cent in the course of the last hundred years. At the beginning of the century there were 976 children under 5 for every 1,000 women between the ages of 15 to 44 years, whereas in 1910 the number was only 508 per thousand women at these ages. During the 60 years between 1850 and 1910 the number of children under 5 per thousand women at the child-bearing ages decreased in the United States by 191, or at an average of 3.2 in each decade. The rate of decline in the recent decades has been so rapid that Prof. Willcox suggests amusingly that if it were continued over a period of a century and a half, which is a comparatively short time in the life of a nation, there would be no children at all at the end of that time.

The decline in the birth rate in the United States has been, as elsewhere, selective in character. In Massachusetts, for example, where the best American data on birth rates are available, we find first, that there has been a continuous decrease in the birth rate during the last 40 years, and, second, that this decrease has been most marked in the native stock. In 1910 the native stock had a birth rate of 14.9 per thousand; the foreign-born birth rate was 49.1 per thousand. In the same year the native death rate was 16.3 per thousand, while the foreign death rate was only 15.4. There was thus an excess of deaths over births corresponding to a net annual loss of a little more than one-tenth of 1 per cent in the native stock, while there was an annual increase of 3.4 per cent among the foreign-born population.

A tabulation of a significant sample of the population returns for the 1910 census shows similar differences in the fecundity of women of native and foreign parentage. In a group of women under 45 years of age, who were married for a period of from 10 to 20 years, the average number of children was found to be 4.1 per married woman. The women of native parentage, however, showed an average of only 2.7 children, whereas the women of foreign parentage showed an average of 4.4 per married woman. In like manner it was found that 7.4 per cent of the women under 45 years, who had been married 10 to 20 years, had borne no children. The women of native parentage had borne no children in 13 per cent of the cases, whereas the women of foreign parentage had borne no children in only 5.7 per cent of the cases. In view of the fact that very few children are born to women who have been unproductive for a period of at least 10 years, we may consider these figures as fairly reliable indices of sterility in the two groups. We find that close to 40 per cent of the married women of native parentage had borne only one or two children, whereas the women of foreign parentage showed only 19 per cent of their number in this group. Finally, only about 10 per cent of the women of native parentage had 5 children or more, whereas 33 per cent of the women of foreign parentage belong in this group.

I hope I am not assuming too much when I infer that these figures show selection in the decline of the birth rate. The race stock which laid the foundations of our institutions during the critical period of our national existence is, in large areas of the country, no longer maintaining itself and its place is being taken gradually but surely by foreign races, which, as we have seen, are reproducing very rapidly.

Additional evidence of the selective character of the declining birth rate is presented in special studies on the size of families of college graduates and of men of science. Thus Phillips, in his work on the birth rate among graduates of Harvard and Yale Universities, shows that the number of children born per married graduate has fallen from about 3.25 in the decade 1850 to 1860, to a little over 2 in the decade 1881 and 1890. Similar facts are observed in the statistics for other college graduates, but none are so low as those for the graduates of colleges for women. Thus we find that the number of children per married woman graduate of Smith College was only 1.3, of Vassar 1.6, of

Bryn Mawr 1.7, and of Holyoke 1.8. Even more significant is the ratio of children per graduate, which for all of these colleges is less than one, due to the fact that less than 50 per cent of the graduates of women's colleges marry. Prof. Cattell further shows in his study of 643 American men of science that the families from which the scientific men had come had an average of 4.7 children, while these scientific men who were married and whose families were complete had an average of only 2.3 children, these figures including all the children born. We shall later see how far from adequate such an average number of children is for maintaining the status quo in the respective groups.

In the preceding discussion I have referred frequently to the number of children per family in groups of our population, and have intimated that some families were small, that others were fairly normal, and that others were large. You may now properly ask me what the average number of children per family should be. The answer to the question depends upon the point of view, namely, upon the amount of natural increase one would wish to see in a generation. As there is likely to be a difference of opinion on this point, I shall attempt to show only what the number of children in a family must be, under present conditions, in order that the population may remain stationary; anything above this figure will mean natural increase, anything below will mean a decrease in population.

It is obvious that the basis of every family is two individuals. The question then resolves itself as follows: How many children must be born to every family in order that two individuals may be raised to maturity? The number of children born must be more than two for a number of reasons. The first is the fact of mortality. The death rate is exceptionally high in the period of childhood, amounting in the first year of life to about 10 per cent of the babies born. If we begin with 100,000 at birth and trace them through from year to year, we find that about 75,000 are alive at the average age at marriage. This is according to the mortality rate that prevails over a large portion of the United States. The rest have died. This fact alone would make it necessary that every marriage result in an average of two and one-half children in order that two persons may attain the average age of marriage and replace their parents in the population. But this assumes, first, that all persons marry, and, second, that every marriage is productive. As a matter of fact, all persons do not marry. In our own country from 12 to 15 per cent do not marry until after the reproductive period, if at all. A considerable proportion of marriages, over 7 per cent, are sterile. When we make the necessary corrections in our figures, the average number of children per family which must be born is increased to close to four in order that the stock may maintain itself without increase or decrease.

I say without hesitation that a large part of the native stock of this country is in this sense not maintaining itself. It is not producing the four children that are necessary to perpetuate the stock. This fact is true primarily for those families in the population which, by economic and social standards, are best able to bear and rear families. On the other hand, those groups in our population which are economically and socially less able to raise families are still producing on the average in excess of the minimum necessary to maintain the status quo. As a result, the balance of population is in favor of the less economically efficient. The best blood of America is being constantly thinned out by the exercise of a conscious limitation of births and is being replaced by a stock of a different order. Our national standards are being leveled to meet more and more the lower quality of our population.

If I have succeeded in making a plausible diagnosis of one of our national ills, will you permit me also to suggest a remedy for the condition? I should say, at the outset, that since many causes have been at work to produce the end result which I have described, it will require many lines of action to improve the situation. I shall, however, suggest some thoughts which seem to me to reach the heart of the problem more nearly than any others.

The State is largely responsible for the present condition. The system of education which it has provided for the youth of the country has failed for the most part to inculcate national ideals. Our young people have grown up without a broad outlook on life. They have been taught to think in terms of personal convenience and advancement, and not in terms of the common good. Democratic education is a failure if it neglects to make provision for the character of its future citizenship. Our young men and women must be taught to realize early that we do not live for ourselves; that our intellectual, economic, and social advancement must be carried forward not only as tradition but more especially in terms of new, vigorous, and worthy personalities. Our educational system must make our various racial groups conscious of their best traditions and instill desires to see their better strains strengthened and increased as a foundation of the greater democracy of the future.

The education of our women is especially faulty in this regard. Our schools and colleges, with few exceptions, direct the thoughts and energies of our girls away from ideals of normal home life and center them upon personal refinement or upon personal ambition. It is no uncommon thing to find that girls have gone through their entire college course without a single occasion when the subject of their place in society as mothers and wives was given serious consideration. No wonder that our educated women think mainly of "careers" or of pleasures offered by society as the aim of existence. These are all false gods which smother the natural and wholesome instincts which every species possesses to insure its maintenance. The old virtues of womanhood need restatement to-day. Whatever else women learn in the schools they must be educated for their place as mothers, and democratic education must make efficient provision for this primary function.

The State is guilty of another sin. It has made no provision to reward, either substantially or with esteem, the women who, realizing their obligation to the State, are willing to bring up families of normal size. The bearing and rearing of children is costly, both in energy and in funds, and must act as a check on personal ambition and on the enjoyment of the freedom and pleasures of social life. A family of four children requires all the attention of the thoughtful and capable woman. Her success as a mother will be at the expense, in the majority of cases, of her achievement in other fields. It is not asking too much that such a woman should be favored with the admiration of the community in which she lives and not, as at present, with its commiseration and pity. The State may find it expedient, likewise, to encourage parenthood by considering the size of the family as a factor, among others, in fixing exemptions from taxes.

Individual selfishness is at the bottom of the evil I have described. An increasing number of men and women do not assume the marital state or, when married, do not raise a family of children because they prefer to live better than their forebears and to spend more

on themselves than would be possible if they had children to raise and educate. Under present conditions children are not an economic asset. Restrictive compulsory education and child-labor laws make children an expensive luxury which only the poor can afford. In fact, there is no very good reason, on the score of personal comfort alone, why individuals should assume the obligations and sacrifices which large families entail. Such, indeed, is the logical conclusion of our growing materialism.

Yet the shallowness of this attitude must be obvious. Men and women who to-day are rallying to the defense of the country in war time need not be reminded that we live not for ourselves but rather for the fuller life of the community. If only the same spirit would animate us in times of peace, more would then meet their obligation to the State through parenthood. A new citizenship would then arise which would be worthy to receive the noble traditions from our past and to carry our civilization forward into the future. Our appeal must be made to the religious impulse in our individual lives. It will require all the religious power latent in our people to set us right. I do not mean the mandate of any particular religious sect but rather the ethical force which arises within us when we realize clearly our relation to the community about us and the obligation which this relationship involves. The problem of the size of the family, like a whole host of other important social questions, will be solved only when men realize the holy purpose of life, that we are here to add to the sum total of the common good; in a word, that we must leave the world better than we have found it.

In conclusion, let me emphasize the need for birth release among the healthy and normal people of our country as a primary national duty. Such release must be conscious and deliberate, the act of will of free individuals who thus express a highly moral purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

SOCIALISM IN AMERICA.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with some hesitancy that, without any preparation, or even with most careful preparation, I enter into a discussion of these matters with a man who has on so many occasions in this House demonstrated himself to be a master of debate. [Applause.] I have listened with great interest to the scholarly address of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON]. We have been fortunate in having in this House, whenever we have had representatives of the Socialist Party, scholarly, capable, pleasant gentlemen, and the gentleman from New York is the peer of any of them in those particulars.

The difficulty about socialism is that as it presents many of its propositions you can not disagree with them. With unalarming advance socialism proceeds in this country and the world, holding, always, every position it gains. I am unwilling to agree with the position that the gentleman takes so positively and with so much force, that the principles enunciated in the President's message to this country and to the world, proposing terms of peace, were discovered by the Socialists of Russia, or were discovered by the Socialists of any other country in the world. Prior to the opening of this awful war, before the invasion of Belgium, 600 peace societies were at work in the civilized nations of the world, every one of them proclaiming as fundamental principles those 14 or 15 propositions contained in the President's message. Our own Declaration of Independence proclaims the right of peoples to govern themselves, and that is the principle which underlies the several peace propositions submitted by the President of the United States; first of all, the right of nations, great or small, to govern themselves and to work out their own destinies. And then there follows, as a matter of course, if that principle is to be recognized in the world, the principle that the nations must disarm, in order that none of them may become strong enough to threaten the existence of smaller and weaker nations. The Socialists of Russia, in announcing these propositions, discovered nothing new; and the fact that a few days later, or about the same time, Lloyd-George, speaking for Great Britain, announced substantially the same propositions, and that a few hours later the President of the United States announced, in substance, the same propositions does not prove that any priority of discovery rests with the Socialists of Russia.

I have been interested in his discussion of this subject to-day, because the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON], with splendid ability and profound scholarship, goes back to the propositions announced by Carl Marx, the greatest of all socialists, and calls attention to socialism in its international aspect; without an international character socialism can not succeed in this world.

And now I want to call the attention of this House to the remarkable advance of socialism among the nations of the world, and of socialistic theories here in these United States. The differences between the parties as at present organized and as this war proceeds are absolutely academic. There are no tariff differences worth mentioning in view of these great questions which loom upon the horizon of the nations. The world is being made over in the fiery ordeal of war, and after this world war closes you will see in this country, in all probability a realignment of parties, greater and more pronounced than occurred during the period of the Civil War and after the Civil War to meet these new issues. Socialism tenders the

greatest of all of them. The time is approaching in this country and in the world for the nations and the statesmen who lead the thought of the nations to determine whether or not socialism is the correct theory upon which nations shall conduct themselves through the centuries to come. Now, let us see how far we have proceeded in this country in the direction of socialism.

The gentleman has discussed Russian socialism in its international aspects. The gentleman is not in harmony with the expressions of his own party in this country or in Germany; and if socialism in this international aspect means what these propositions indicate, the propositions which it is alleged they have submitted to Germany, then there seems to be no apparent present international danger from the spread of socialism. But within the boundaries of Russia as they existed recently socialism is developing and developing with a wonderful rapidity.

We must remember that 80, and perhaps 90, per cent of the people of Russia are illiterate. They are not to blame for that. They are struggling through illiteracy—let us hope the millions there are struggling toward the light. They believe they are. I remember as I stand here some of the facts of Russian history. I remember that during the early centuries of the Christian era the Slavs, protected by the towering heights of the Carpathian Mountains, slowly developed and spread over Russia, without any organization, because they did not need any organization; without any head men, without any chiefs, without any central organization of any kind, because they were in no danger from their neighbors. Rome had extended her boundaries as far in that direction as she cared to extend them, and under these circumstances and without any sort of a government the Slav nations developed until they spread over Russia. Then there came the failure of the Byzantine Empire, and the necessity for protection against their enemies; and the socialistic theories which prevailed then, although they did not call it socialism and had never heard of its principles, of course were unable to protect them against their enemies. They invited the Russ, the Norsemen of the Baltic Sea, great blond warriors, who came down there at their invitation, covered with iron armor, and built castles outside of their villages, and exacted a military tribute. And then, following the advent of the Russ, there came the Tartars, and then the Muscovite kings, and from that developed the Romanoff régime, which lasted until a recent period, and which cemented these vastly different types of people at least into one great nation.

The situation in Russia to-day is this: Ninety per cent of the population, an illiterate population, following a few dreamers, have thrown off the Russ, the Tartar, and the Muscovite king influences, and have harked back to the ninth century, when they had only village organizations, and nothing else.

They will develop in time as other nations have, and if it takes them as long as it has taken other nations to develop from an organization of that kind into the present modern State, it will take 1,000 years. I hope the Russians are proceeding in the proper direction, and that they are working out their proper salvation.

PRINCIPLES UPON WHICH ALL RUSSIAN FACTIONS AGREE.

As I stand here I recall the principles upon which all elements in Russian politics to-day are united, including the Don Cossacks, who are small land owners. They stand united upon these three propositions: First, the giving of the land to the peasants; second, the distribution of the profits of industries among the workingmen; third, the compelling of the well-to-do to pay all the expenses of the Government. In harmony with the latter proposition, they have confiscated the deposits in the banks of Russia, with the guarantee only that the smaller deposits will be protected for the smaller depositors. And if we are to believe the reports which reach this Capital City, they have confiscated even the deposits in the banks placed there by this Government to maintain in their capital city an embassy representing the greatest Republic in the world. These tendencies are not encouraging.

HOW FAR HAVE WE PROGRESSED IN SOCIALISM?

Now, let us see how far we are proceeding in this country in the direction of socialism. It may be all right in its international aspects according to present international world politics, as explained so ably and so clearly by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON]; but as an interior force within the nations it is obtaining its expression in Russia to-day, and we know what it means. I am not ready to agree to the spread of socialistic theories, so far as I am concerned.

Now, let us see how far we are progressing in that direction. We have taken over the railroads with the approval of all their employees, and with the vociferous and apparently unanimous approval of the owners of the railroads themselves. And the fact that the owners of the railroads approve the taking over of the railroads is evidenced by the fact that they are so anxious

to acquire more and more of the stock that the stock is increasing in value almost by leaps and bounds. The employees of the railroads are all for the proposition, because they expect larger compensation for their services. The owners of the railroads are in favor of the proposition because they expect from their investment a larger and a more assured income.

The millionaire owners of railroads, the million or more employees of railroads, are proceeding in the same socialistic direction, demanding more and more compensation, and expecting it now to be guaranteed by the Treasury of the United States, or paid out of the Treasury of the United States. We sit here to-day face to face with the proposition that one-fifth—certainly one-sixth—of the adult voting population of the United States are either directly or indirectly on the national pay roll, and that you have here the power to increase or decrease their compensation. I know of no railroad employee, I know of no Government employee, who does not want his compensation increased. They are willing, all of them, that it be done out of the Treasury of the United States, and there is no definite objection or protest against this by any party or any definite section of the population of this country. All of them apparently stand for it, and that is socialism, of course.

We just agreed to a resolution a few minutes ago in this House which means the ultimate ownership and control of the water-power possibilities in this country by the Government itself. In 50 years from now it will mean it, they say, and if Government ownership proceeds to gather momentum with the rapidity that it has in the recent weeks it will not be long until we take them over. We are already controlling the distribution of the coal supply. It is not logical to control the distribution of coal unless you control also the coal mines of the country. The owners of the coal mines will not object, and the millions of employees who work in the mines will not object. If you take over the coal, why not take over the copper mines and the iron mines. The owners of those mines will not object, because it means that under our theory of government we must compensate them. We can not confiscate their property. They are willing to be compensated and to live without effort on their part their lives hereafter, their compensation insured out of the Treasury of the United States.

If you take over all these things, why not take over the instruments for the distribution of intelligence. That is the logical thing—to take over the telegraph and the telephones of the country. It is just as logical to control them as it is to control the Postal Service of the country. You will find that the owners will not object; they will be satisfied, because it means an easy income for them and for their children, paid out of the Treasury of the United States as long as they may live, or an adequate lump-sum compensation for the taking over of their property. And so we plunge along, being irresistibly drawn in this country into the very maelstrom of socialism.

The Government can do any one thing better than any one private individual or any one group of individuals. The Government can control the railroads better than private individuals. The Government can control the telephone and the telegraph better than private individuals. The Government can do any one thing better than any individual or any aggregation of individuals can do it. But when the Government commences to do them all, what sort of a situation are you up against?

HOW SOCIALISM MAY COME.

When the Government commences to control all these things, with the approval of all the employees of these industries, with the approval of all the owners, then that party which favors the perpetuity of Government control and ownership when this war ends—that party which pledges its unequivocal support of these things—will win in the elections, of course. There will be enough voters believing themselves to be compensated out of the Treasury to make it possible for that party to win, and when that party wins under these circumstances socialism has arrived in this Nation. Then there comes these other things to which so large a portion of the people of the United States seem to be chaining themselves without knowing it—a different method of holding land—perhaps it will be a single-tax system or a method of communal ownership. If everybody is compensated by the State, then there must be a confiscation of private property and private incomes. All of the parties in Russia, including the Don Cossacks, have declared against private ownership of any kind of property. The Don Cossacks, in their resolutions a short time ago, as announced in the papers of this country, say that confiscation of land applies only to the large estates, that estates as large as they own will not be taken. And so we plunge along on this perilous road without setting any danger signals.

I have heard able socialistic speeches made upon the floor, none abler than the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] can make; but I have never heard a Member of Congress during my long period of service here who has had enough courage to rise in his place on this floor and express dissent from any of the propositions or tendencies to socialism in this country, and the time has now come when you must do it or submit. We must do the things we are now doing in order to win this war. When the war ends it is going to be a difficult matter to maintain our methods of government as they now exist and as they have existed from the days of the founders. It is going to be an easy thing to sink into socialism with all that socialism may mean to the people of the country. While we are making the world safe for democracy we must not make it safe for socialism.

IS THE SOCIALIST PARTY LOYAL?

I do not want my friend from New York to "throw anything at me," and I am sure he will not say that I am a "demagogue" if I question the loyalty to this Government in this present crisis of the party he represents here in this body. So I am simply going to read from recent declarations as expressed by them in their emergency convention held here in the United States just after we declared war.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. RAINEY. I prefer not to yield now.

Mr. LONDON. I would ask the gentleman as a favor to yield to me at this moment.

Mr. RAINEY. I will do anything for the gentleman as a favor except to agree to follow the gentleman in his socialistic career.

Mr. LONDON. The word "recent" in connection with the war will not be applicable to that statement. That statement was adopted a short time after the declaration of war—a few days—in the excitement in the change of the national situation.

Mr. RAINEY. The gentleman is right. When I said that it was a recent declaration I did not mean that. I meant, and I think I said, that I am about to read the declaration of the principles of the Socialist Party in the United States, which immediately followed our entry into this war, and it was made while the declaration of a state of war was being discussed and unanimously approved by the loyal citizens of the United States. Mr. Speaker, the Socialists are splendidly organized; they can get their conventions together quickly, and the 200 men who assembled in that emergency convention to prepare a platform for the Socialists of the country, in the dangerous emergency which confronted this Nation, spoke for the Socialists of the Nation, and they have had no further meetings since in which they have revoked their position or their doctrines. These are their serious pronouncements, the planks in their war platform. With reference to our recent declaration of war, with the news still going over the wires every day that in violation of all moral law, in violation of all treaties, in violation of all laws of the seas, Americans were being murdered upon the seas, in spite of the fact that at that very moment great ships with the American flag painted upon their sides were lying at the bottom of the British Channel, sunk by a treacherous enemy, while claiming to be our friend, they said in this convention of theirs, referring to our entry into the war—and I quote the exact language:

Our entry into this war is a crime against the people of the United States and the nations of the world.

That is what the Socialists of this country stood for then; that is what they stand for this day. I have heard no repudiation of that principle from the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON], who represents all the Socialists in the United States here in this body. Is that consonant with loyalty? Will any loyal body of the citizens of the United States agree to such a proposition as that? With the spectacle of bleeding Belgium, of unfortunate Serbia, presented to us, with the news of the outraging of women and the murder of children coming to us every day, while the red glow of the burning villages of Belgium covered the skies, they say that our entry into the war was a crime against nations. A crime against what nation? Was it a crime against unfortunate Belgium? Was it a crime against bleeding Serbia? Was it a crime against the people of northern France being cruelly murdered by the merciless invaders? The proclamation proceeds, and I quote again the exact language of this latest Socialistic platform in the United States:

In all modern history there has been no war more unjustifiable than the war in which we are about to engage.

I know my friend would not charge me with being a demagogue. I do not say such expressions are disloyal. It is unnecessary for me to say that—it is unnecessary for any loyal

citizen to say that—but that language speaks for itself. It spoke for itself at that time and has spoken for itself throughout the months that have passed since it was first uttered.

I proceed to read again from this latest platform of the Socialist Party of the United States. They proceed then to pronounce against the delusions—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes. Is there objection to the request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RAINEY. After referring to the delusions of so-called defensive wars, they say—and I quote again:

The only struggle which would justify the workers in taking up arms is a struggle of the working class of the world to free itself from economic exploitation and political oppression.

In other words, the Socialists of these United States are pledged by this platform against this war. They are pledged by this platform to engage in no war except a war which permits them to take up arms against their own exploitation here in this country and against the political oppression which they may find here. Many of them came here from the oppressed sections of other countries and they seem to have become leaders of the Socialists of the United States, and they come here claiming in this convention that the only fight the Socialists of the United States will make is a fight against this great Government; that they will take up arms in this Nation for the purpose, and for the purpose alone, of overcoming the present method of doing things here. Now, is that loyalty to this Government or is that disloyalty? You know and the country knows what that is, and I am not here for the purpose of designating what that is.

Any patriotic citizen of the United States knows whether that sort of an argument, whether that sort of a platform, is loyal or disloyal. It comes as near grazing the edge of treason as any expression I have heard in this country from any one man or from any body of men. And so, unless we are careful, this world menace of Socialism, plausibly proceeding and gaining ground slowly and in an unalarming manner, is the real issue of the future.

PRESENT AND FUTURE ISSUES.

We have been divided here in the United States upon the question of the tariff. We never got out of the protective tariff more than the sum of \$333,000,000 a year in the peak year of the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill. We attempted to reduce the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill to \$280,000,000. As a matter of fact, in our peak year under the Underwood bill, until the war interrupted its procedure, we got \$225,000,000 a year. A tariff bill can be arranged by imposing maximum rates upon all schedules which will yield \$400,000,000 and that will not mean protection. It will mean that certain schedules must be lowered. It will not mean free trade, but will mean certain schedules must be higher, but as compared to the stupendous budget which will confront this country when this war is over the question of a protective tariff or a tariff for revenue only is from a standpoint of revenue absolutely negligible. If this war continues three or four years longer—and it will in all probability—if this war continues that much longer we have staring us in the face, if we retire a billion and a half dollars of bonds a year, and we must retire that much—we have staring us in the face an annual budget of, how much? An annual budget of \$6,000,000,000, and the \$80,000,000 of tariff fluctuation we can get for the Treasury or take out of the Treasury is absolutely negligible.

If the parties in this country as at present organized continue these mock battles of theirs upon issues which are now absolutely academic, upon little issues that do not deserve consideration in this present great age of the world—when the world is being made over—if they continue that sort of course, they will find confronting both of them the specter of socialism in this land as well as throughout the world. The question is, Are you ready for it? Do you stand for the things that Russian socialism—and that is the only nation that has ever had an opportunity to express itself upon this question—do you stand for the things they stand for in Russia, or are you opposed to them?

Do not deceive yourselves. The old order is changing in the world. These new issues are presenting themselves with great force, and they must be met. And it is the province of the political parties of this country to express themselves along these lines and to get ready when this war is over to lower the floodgates; to return, if they can, to the sane methods of holding property; to adhere to sane methods of holding land; to reestablish and maintain the methods of administering the

affairs of the people of this Republic under which we have prospered and progressed—the methods which have prevailed in the world since the birth of the modern state. [Applause.]

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. CALDWELL, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Lizzie Yarker, H. R. 9344, Sixty-fourth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. BROWNE, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of John P. Chesley, no adverse report having been made thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SUFFRAGE RESOLUTION.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that House joint resolution No. 1, a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women, be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that House joint resolution No. 1 be laid on the table.

Mr. WEBB. Otherwise the calendar would have to carry it for the remainder of the session, and nobody wants that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, let me inquire if permission has been granted to adjourn over until Monday?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes; it has.

Mr. RAINEY. Then I move that the House do now adjourn. The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, January 14, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting communication from the Secretary of State submitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the State Department for the fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 784); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting detailed report of the expenditures of all moneys appropriated thereunder during the period from August 10 to November 15, 1917, inclusive (H. Doc. No. 785); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8061) granting a pension to Emily Ballard; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6226) granting a pension to William W. Cravens; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1024) granting a pension to Francis G. Babcock; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 8625) to accept from the Southern Oregon Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Oregon, a reconveyance of the lands granted to the State of Oregon by the act approved March 3, 1869, entitled "An act granting lands to the State of Oregon to aid in the construction of a military wagon road from the navigable waters of Coos Bay to Roseburg, in said State," commonly known as the Coos Bay Wagon Road grant, to provide for the disposition of

said lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MEEKER: A bill (H. R. 8626) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to inquire into whether or not the immigrant Cherokees by blood are entitled to be reimbursed for lands allotted to intermarried white persons from lands granted to immigrant Cherokees by blood under treaty of 1835 and the patent of December, 1838, from the United States Government to the Cherokees by blood and their descendants, and inquire into and determine the validity of the treaty of 1866; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 8627) making an appropriation for the improvement of the harbor of Stamford, Conn.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TAGUE: A bill (H. R. 8628) to increase the cost of the immigration station at Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8629) to extend the provisions of the bond and warehouse statement to merchandise free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8630) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OSBORNE: A bill (H. R. 8631) providing a Liberty Loan bond redemption fund, for the purpose of stabilizing and maintaining at par the various series of liberty loan bonds which have been issued by the United States, and making an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 8632) authorizing the expenditure of a portion of an unexpended appropriation for the improvement of a road in the counties of Cass and Beltrami, in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 8633) to establish a common-commodities commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 8634) to prohibit speculation in cotton or wool; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILLIARD: A bill (H. R. 8635) to establish in the District of Columbia a laboratory for the study of the criminal, pauper, and defective classes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8636) to assist the worthy mother who by reason of insufficient property or income or lack of earning capacity is unable to support her children; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 8637) to amend the act approved June 25, 1910, establishing postal savings depositories, and acts amendatory thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 8638) to amend sections 9 and 10 of the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 8639) to exempt persons engaged in agriculture from military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 8640) granting to the State of Minnesota certain public lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8641) to authorize the erection of a public building at Litchfield, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8642) authorizing the erection of a public building at Marshall, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 8643) to authorize the President to further increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KREIDER: A bill (H. R. 8644) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SABATH: Resolution (H. Res. 221) providing for a clerk for the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 213) proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States to authorize the Congress to enact laws to define and limit the causes for divorce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 8645) granting an increase of pension to Walden Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 8646) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8647) granting an increase of pension to Albinus Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8648) granting an increase of pension to Joseph R. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 8649) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Sigerfoos; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8650) granting an increase of pension to William C. Blyler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8651) granting a pension to Abraham G. Hendryx; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 8652) for the relief of John P. Chesley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8653) granting a pension to Bernard Klatt; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 8654) granting a pension to William F. Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 8655) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue deed to G. H. Beckwith for certain land within the Flathead Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 8656) granting an increase of pension to Jacob H. B. Leuty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILLIARD: A bill (H. R. 8657) for the relief of Richard A. Schwab; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 8658) granting an increase of pension to Iven Brandon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8659) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Brooks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8660) granting a pension to Mary C. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 8661) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 8662) granting a pension to Anna K. Sabin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8663) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 8664) granting a pension to Olaf H. Heiele; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8665) granting a pension to Charles Dueber; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8666) granting a pension to Richard M. Van Dervort; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 8667) for the payment of certain claims for travel pay from the place where honorably discharged to place of enlistment, growing out of service in the Army, as reported by the Court of Claims; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8668) for the payment of certain soldiers' claims growing out of service in the Army, as reported by the Court of Claims, known as three months' pay claims; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LESHER: A bill (H. R. 8669) granting an increase of pension to C. F. Deivert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8670) granting an increase of pension to Oliver E. Yohey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 8671) granting an increase of pension to Arthur W. Brittingham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8672) granting an increase of pension to Susan Owens; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8673) granting a pension to Fred H. Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 8674) granting an increase of pension to Henry Sonders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VOIGT: A bill (H. R. 8675) granting an increase of pension to Alvin O. Thayer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8676) granting a pension to Elmer R. Harrington; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 8677) granting a pension to Burton Erwin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 8678) granting a pension to Rebecca Buffington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8679) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8680) granting an increase of pension to Charles Delong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8681) granting an increase of pension to John T. Waxler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8682) granting an increase of pension to Barbara I. Boothby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8683) granting an increase of pension to Joseph D. Heston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8684) granting a pension to Louis Settles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8685) granting a pension to Alonzo Hutchison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8686) granting a pension to Adam Mikel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8687) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8688) granting a pension to Anna M. Bremigan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8689) granting a pension to Ida McCoy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8690) granting a pension to Alvan P. Henery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8691) granting a pension to Annie Hoover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8692) granting a pension to Matilda Cass Lipps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 8693) granting an increase of pension to Reuben J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 8694) granting an increase of pension to Marvin J. Boughton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of F. W. Oulcott, of New York, favoring passage of the daylight-saving bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Mabel Gordon Parker, of Brooklyn, N. Y., asking passage of resolution for investigation of the O. G. Library League; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of National Association of Chiropodists, favoring bill for appointment of podiatrists in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of railway postal clerks of San Francisco Bay region, favoring increase in salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of 1,235 citizens of the twelfth congressional district of Massachusetts, favoring the Federal suffrage amendment; to the committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Memorial of Hon. C. S. Speaker, chairman, Lisbon (Ohio) Division of National Defense League, against peace or relaxation of American efforts until German militarism is decisively defeated; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, evidence in support of the bill granting increase of pension to Iven Brandon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of the bill granting an increase of pension to Stephen Brooks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of the bill granting pension to Mary C. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Resolution of 1,200 citizens of Rhode Island, favoring passage of Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. LUNN: Petition of American Defense Society of the State of New York, asking passage of a bill to punish all persons, etc., responsible for pro-German activities; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEEKER: Memorial of Board of Aldermen of St. Louis, Mo., favoring bill authorizing the completion of the municipal free bridge across the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Tenth Ward Improvement Association of St. Louis, Mo., favoring time extension for the completion of

the municipal free bridge across the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of Branch 343, of St. Louis, Mo., of the National Association of Letter Carriers, in favor of H. R. 1654, providing for an increase in salary of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of A. H. Shields and other old soldiers of Havana, Ill., against \$25 pensions for widows while many soldiers are drawing less than \$20; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Resolution adopted by the City Council of Minneapolis, Minn., urging Congress to enact legislation to punish persons interfering with the Government in the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

MONDAY, January 14, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our hearts are saddened as we come together by the news of the death of another Member of this Senate. We thank Thee for the life and character of the distinguished Senator who has gone from our midst. We will cherish his memory. He was among us who served faithfully and devotedly the interests of his country, kind and generous in his friendships, patriotic, and consecrated to the highest ideals of Christian civilization. We pray that Thou wilt impress us this day with the great fact that in the midst of life we are in death, that we may catch the inspirations of life from the sweet memories that linger with us of those who have gone before us and conform our lives to the Divine ideals, that we may be ready for the passage into that eternal world beyond. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Friday last when, on request of Mr. MARTIN and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] I ask that he be excused from further service as a member and chairman of the Committee on Immigration, and at the request of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] I ask that he be excused from further service as a member and chairman of the Committee on Industrial Expositions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARTIN. I ask unanimous consent that the following committee assignments may be made. I send the order to the desk and ask that it may have immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Ordered, That Senator SMITH of South Carolina be appointed chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce;

That Senator HARDWICK be appointed chairman of the Committee on Immigration;

That Senator CHAMBERLAIN be appointed a member of the Committee on Coast Defenses;

That Senator JAMES be appointed a member of the Committee on Interstate Commerce; and

That Senator JOHNSON of South Dakota be appointed a member of the Committee on Public Lands.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by G. F. Turner, one of its clerks, announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2316) to promote export trade, and for other purposes, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. WEBB, Mr. CARLIN, and Mr. VOLSTEAD managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6176. An act extending the time for the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River at or near the city of Fairmont, W. Va.; and

H. R. 8496. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.